

IMITATION AND IMAGERY IN SHAKESPEARE:
FACTORS OF ORIGINALITY IN *ROMEO AND*
JULIET, AS YOU LIKE IT, AND
TWELFTH NIGHT

By
DON W. DER

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1968

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank the chairman of my special supervisory committee, Dr. T. Walter Herbert, for his guidance in planning my dissertation and for his many helpful suggestions during the revision of the first draft, and the other members of the committee, Drs. Aubrey L. Williams and Thomas L. Hanna, for their willingness to give me their time in spite of delays and scheduling problems. In addition I owe a great debt to the various academic units of the University itself, without whose support I could not have completed the degree; in particular, I am indebted to the Departments of Comprehensive English and Comprehensive Logic and the University of Florida Libraries. Finally, I thank my wife for her help in preparing the final version.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	11
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I	12
CHAPTER II	80
CHAPTER III	118
CHAPTER IV	162
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	216

INTRODUCTION

Professor H. O. White says that "Shakspeare's practise of imitative composition is too well known to require comment. It is a commonplace to say that the originality of his genius never appears more clearly than when one of his works is compared with the sources which he found useful in writing it."¹ Those who agree with Professor White may possibly need to read no further, since one aim of this study is to review evidence which shows that during Shakespeare's lifetime, imitation, as a method of composition, was a common, almost inevitable, literary practice and to argue that imitation necessarily entailed certain commonly understood, if un-promulgated, rules concerning the originality of an imitation.

Growing out of this first objective is a second, to demonstrate that in his use of figurative and allusive language Shakespeare achieved one kind of originality when transforming the work of another author into a play. The comparison and interpretation involved also reveal that Shakespeare, even though closely following his original's story line, also achieved originality of theme and meaning.

If, as Professor White claims, these things were already well known, then this study would be useless. However, I believe that my approach will be of some interest even to those who are somewhat familiar with the subject. Those who are as ignorant of imitative composition as I when I started the study, and I suspect

they are in the majority, may find it informative and, I hope, thought-provoking.

This study began when I read Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet and its source, Brooke's Romeus and Juliet, in preparation for another project. Source and play were remarkably alike in most respects; yet each was undeniably different. The most obvious explanation for this difference is that Shakespeare was the better artist. Another more meaningful, but as unsatisfactory, explanation is that Brooke and Shakespeare were writing in different genres.

Before I concluded that Shakespeare was imitating Brooke, several questions nagged at me. Why did Shakespeare choose to adapt Brooke's poem to the stage? That the playwright, an acknowledged genius, should dramatize a poem which is certainly no masterpiece puzzled me. Again, there were the stock answers to this question: Shakespeare's genius was such that he could not conceive of an original plot; or, he was in such a hurry to produce plays that he simply had no time to manufacture new stories. While the latter explanation is better than the former, neither is as satisfactory as the possibility that Shakespeare was capitalizing on the popularity of his source, which would explain, to the modern reader at least, his retention with but little change of the names of the characters of the poem.² None of these answers is finally conclusive, however.

Another question which concerned me was why the two works were different. Given essentially the same cast of characters and the same sequence of events, why was Shakespeare's play so completely different from Brooke's poem? And, since the two were so obviously

unlike, why did Shakespeare choose Brooke as his source rather than some work which might have been closer to his concerns at that time?

These questions will never be finally resolved, but I believe my study offers a partial answer, not only for Romeo and Juliet and its source, but also for As You Like It and Twelfth Night and their sources. Furthermore, it is an answer peculiarly modern and local, since there was a time in the not too distant past when the first part of this study would have been superfluous. Only in relatively recent times has the word "imitation" taken on pejorative connotations, and the word's decline coincided with the decline of the so-called classical education. In 1947, my wife, as a college freshman, used a handbook of rhetoric written by a man educated in the South early in this century and, therefore, in the more or less classical tradition. It included a section of sentence patterns which the student was urged to "imitate." In the last few years I have examined a number of books designed to teach freshmen to write. While most provide "models" of various sorts for the student, none forthrightly encourages him to imitate. Similarly, motion pictures sometimes so faithfully reproduce a novel that they could be called imitations, but are referred to as adaptations. The French, on the other hand, seem to have a better understanding of imitation, whatever they call the practice. Witness Anouilh's Antigone. Admittedly, circumstances forced him to resort to subterfuge, but he and the educated among his audience must have been aware that the play was, in the classical sense, an imitation. Modern insistence in Britain and America that originality in literature precludes any utilization of another's work, particularly plot, has caused us to forget that imitation was

.

a time-honored method of composition. Thus, White, writing more than thirty years ago, could assume widespread knowledge of the practice, an assumption no longer correct.

White's book was the first thoroughly to explore imitative composition and, as far as I can determine, the last. The failure of scholars to exploit the subject is puzzling, particularly since English literature from the Renaissance through the neo-classical period affords any number of examples. The most obvious occur in the eighteenth century and are often acknowledged by their authors to be imitations. There are, for example, Samuel Johnson's The Vanity of Human Wishes in Imitation of the Tenth Satire of Juvenal and Alexander Pope's Imitations of Horace. . Pope's imitation of Donne's satires proves not only the classical authors were imitated. Much earlier, Spenser acknowledged his "imitation" in The Shepheardes Calender, and many of the sonnets of Wyatt and Surrey are imitations of Petrarch. Despite the ample opportunities for scholarship in this area, it has been largely neglected.

Unlike Pope and Johnson, Shakespeare failed to indicate clearly when or whom he was imitating, and his unfortunate oversight necessitates the first chapter of this study. That chapter accomplishes several aims. It distinguishes imitation from Aristotelian mimesis, it identifies imitation as one of several practices subsumed under the general heading of rhetoric, and it comments particularly upon the common practice of basing a work of literature on some pre-existing work.

To establish Shakespeare's awareness of imitation as a method of composition, the grammar school curriculum is surveyed. This

survey indicates that no one who had been exposed to such an education could possibly have been ignorant of imitative composition, since it and a closely allied practice, translation, were prominent features of the curriculum from the time the student, no matter how young, entered the school until his final departure. Most authorities agree that Shakespeare was in grammar school for five or six years, and he, therefore, would have been influenced by his training there.

Even if he had no formal schooling, he could hardly have participated in the literary life of his time without an indoctrination in the practice. A review of the remarks of prominent writers from Sidney to Daniel proves the widespread knowledge of, and interest in, the subject. No one interested in literature could have avoided amassing a workable knowledge of imitative composition.

Because Renaissance attitudes toward imitation stem from classical theory, the comments of several Greek and Roman writers are surveyed. These reveal their concern with the problems of originality. The imitator was required to be original in his imitation, and originality was possible through selection, reinterpretation, or improvement. It is clear that the English writers of the Renaissance understood and followed this prescription of the ancients.

These facts have led me to conclude that Shakespeare, when writing a play which closely followed a source, was engaged in the practice of imitative composition and was therefore aware of, and concerned with, the necessity for originality. To test this theory I have examined three of Shakespeare's plays and their sources with respect to one area wherein originality might be expected, imagery,

in the widest possible sense of that word. To simplify my task further, I have chosen plays which in the consensus of critical opinion are based on a single contemporary English source.

Neither of the two most comprehensive books on Shakespeare's imagery is concerned with the kind of comparisons I make. Professor Clemen's The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery³ is concerned with the evolution of the imagery, and Professor Spurgeon's Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us attempts to reach some conclusions about the playwright's "personality, temperament and thought" and "the themes and characters of the plays."⁴ My method of classifying the images more closely resembles that of Caroline Spurgeon than of Clemen.

Professor Francis R. Johnson's "Shakespearian Imagery and Senecan Imitation"⁵ demonstrates how Shakespeare and other Renaissance authors utilized passages from Seneca; it is gratifying that his conclusions about the practice of imitation in the grammar schools and its effect upon the students agree with mine.

Since Romeo and Juliet first stimulated my thinking about the subject, I begin with it. Although there are a number of areas from which the language of Brooke's poem is drawn, the most clearly dominant one is that of fortune. This image suggests that at least one concern of the poem is to present to its readers a world in which man's fate is in the hands of chance.

Shakespeare, on the other hand, closely imitates Brooke's plot but not his imagery, for my study of the language of the play reveals a much more complex structure of figurative and allusive language. The play is marked by a richness of imagery dominated by

darkness and light, wealth, and religion. This complexity of imagery, further complicated by many inversions, portrays, in contrast to that of Brooke's poem, a complex world capable of the many explanations offered by the play's characters--explanations none of which are finally adequate.

Next to be examined is As You Like It and its source, Thomas Lodge's euphuistic romance, Rosalynde. The romance is marked by a diversity of figurative and allusive language determined not so much by considerations of plot or theme as by the prescriptions of the genre to which Rosalynde belongs. Among other imperatives, euphuism demanded that its author draw upon unnatural natural history for figures of speech, and, as a result, the romance portrays an often exotic, but realistically detailed, world. Rosalynde represents a successful attempt to capture a style, which comprised almost the whole of the art. Consequently, it could not be expected to have a dominant imagery, as a work concerned with theme or mood might have.

In imitating Lodge, Shakespeare, therefore, had to exercise considerable originality, for his play was something more than an exercise in style. The action of As You Like It takes place in a never-never land, wherein ultimately all wrongs are righted and all lovers find their true mates, a world only coincidentally similar to that in which we live. The imagery of the play, while typically varied, helps to achieve this vision. For example, as if in deliberate contrast to the exotic but real world of the romance, the nature imagery of the play suggests a world ordinary in appearance, yet ideal. Imagery drawn from one area, wealth, clearly dominates and is instrumental in establishing the play's concern for value.

The last two works compared are Rich's Apolonius and Silla and Shakespeare's Twelfth Night. Although the imagery of the tale is drawn from a number of areas, two bodies of figurative and allusive language can be seen to dominate; these are sickness and wealth. This imagery suggests the tale's major concern: the worthlessness of love in the absence of honor.

Shakespeare for the first time appears to have been strongly influenced by his source's imagery. Although the play exhibits the playwright's usual fecundity, he adopts these same dominant images, but not without the significant variation which assures originality. The wealth imagery in the play emphasizes the necessity of an equitable exchange of love, and, most important, the sickness imagery indicates that the malady with which Shakespeare is concerned in the play is love melancholy, an affliction none can escape.

Other than the relationships which I have noted between each of the pairs of sources and plays, I could see no uniformity of treatment nor progression of technique. The immediate concerns of each of the plays seem to have dictated that play's imagery.

Perhaps a similar study of the other plays which depend largely upon a single source would produce some generalized knowledge. The present study would be more useful if it included Troilus and Cressida, Measure for Measure, King Lear, and The Winter's Tale, each of which is based largely upon a single English source. All's Well That Ends Well very possibly deserves to be included since it may also have a native source. In the writing of these and the three plays examined here, Shakespeare was involved in the imitation of his fellow countrymen.

Others of the comedies and tragedies present problems. For some the source is not known, and for others it is not native. A study of this latter group, however, might prove rewarding, for it would be interesting to know if Shakespeare approached a foreign source differently from an English one. Such a study might also allow some inferences about the quantity and quality of the playwright's knowledge of Latin and Italian. One group of plays, Julius Caesar, Macbeth, and Antony and Cleopatra, offers unique problems; for their sources are not fictive. Should one satisfactorily analyze these plays, he would be in an ideal position to treat the histories and their sources.

Quite probably the greatest value of my study is to remind the modern reader of imitative composition and call his attention to certain of its implications. It is, ultimately, a kind of source study in which I have tried, by concentrating on source and play in turn, to avoid the fragmentation which Wellek and Warren claim results from the attempt to isolate single traits. They point out:

The relationship between two or more works of literature can be discussed profitably only when we see them in their proper place within the scheme of literary development. Relationships between works of art present a critical problem of comparing two wholes, two configurations not to be broken into isolated components except for preliminary study.⁶

This latter kind of analysis of Shakespeare's plays and their sources, so essential to the establishment of the relationships between the two, is no longer necessary, unless, of course, new possibilities are discovered.

But, when the play is considered to be an imitation of the source, and I believe it is, a different kind of comparison can be made. As the authors of Theory of Literature say:

When the comparison is really focused on two totalities, we shall be able to come to conclusions on a fundamental problem of literary history, that of originality. Originality is usually misconceived in our time as meaning a mere violation of tradition, or it is sought for at the wrong place, in the mere material of the work of art, or in its mere scaffolding--the traditional plot, the conventional framework. In earlier periods, there was a sounder understanding of the nature of literary creation, a recognition that the artistic value of a merely original plot or subject matter was small. The Renaissance and Neo-Classicism rightly ascribed great importance to translating, especially the translating of poetry, and to "imitation" in the sense in which Pope imitated Horace's satires or Dr. Johnson, Juvenal's.⁷

They could have easily cited Shakespeare's use of his sources to illustrate the kind of imitation they meant.

In any case, this study is concerned with just that sort of imitation and the comparison that reveals originality.

NOTES

1. Harold Ogden White, Plagiarism and Imitation During the English Renaissance (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935), p. 106. Professor White's book has been indispensable to my study, as will be further evident in the next chapter.
2. Shakespeare did vary the names of characters in the other two plays studied, retaining some from the source and changing others in the case of As You Like It, and retaining none in Twelfth Night. These variations in names might be worth further study.
3. Wolfgang H. Clemen, The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951).
4. Caroline F.E. Spurgeon, Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935), p. ix.
5. Francis R. Johnson, "Shakespearian Imagery and Senecan Imitation," John Quincy Adams Memorial Studies, ed. J. G. McManaway et al. (Washington: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1948).
6. René Wellek and Austin Warren, Theory of Literature (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1956), pp. 248-249.
7. Ibid., p. 249.

CHAPTER ONE

This chapter has a number of interrelated goals. The term "imitation" will first be defined, and it will be established that a general awareness of imitation as a method of composition existed throughout the English Renaissance, during which time the method was taught in schools and assumed in literary discussions involving the subject of composition. Then will be argued the proposition that the English attitude toward imitation during this period reflected the classical attitude, particularly insofar as originality of the imitation is concerned. Finally, a method of analyzing certain of Shakespeare's plays and their sources, a method dependent upon the discussion of imitation presented in this chapter, will be introduced. That method is simply to examine, by comparing the imagery of a particular play by Shakespeare with the imagery of that play's source, the modification Shakespeare made in that aspect of composition called imagery. The results of such an examination will show that, in the case of each of the pairs of play and source, the source has an imagery, in some instances disorganized, and Shakespeare's play has another, in every instance organized. The relationship between each pair examined is clear, for Shakespeare retained enough of the prior work to warrant the claim that, in the modern simple sense, he imitated. This chapter will demonstrate that even when he was most original, specifically when constructing a system of metaphor that

gives the completely distinctive flavor to a play, Shakespeare was also, in the sixteenth-century sense, practicing imitation.

I

The word "imitation" was used somewhat ambiguously during the English Renaissance, and nowhere is this ambiguity more apparent than in Sir Philip Sidney's "An Apologie for Poetrie." Imitation can mean the attempt to follow nature: "Poesie . . . is an arte of imitation, for so Aristotle termeth it in his word Mimesis."¹ But it can also mean to follow in the footsteps of others. Hence, while Sidney on the one hand can laud the "right Poets" as "they which most properly do imitate to teach and delight, and to imitate borrow nothing of what is, hath been, or shall be,"² he can also sanction the practice of imitating others:

A Poet no industrie can make, if his owne Genius bee not carried unto it: and therefore is it an old Proverbe, Orator fit, Poeta nascitur. Yet confesse I alwayes that as the firtilest ground must bee manured, so must the highest flying wit have a Dedalus to guide him.³

The contradictions in these two passages are glaring. The paradox of the first, as Harold Ogden White notes, can only be resolved if it is remembered that "Elizabethan literary theorists . . . continually employ the word 'imitation,' without distinction, for following nature (mimesis) and for following other writers."⁴ The same explanation resolves the contradiction of the second passage, a contradiction which Sidney himself seems to realize existed between the idea that a poet was born, not made, and the idea that a poet needed a guide.

Despite the ambiguous usage of the word, examination of the contexts in which it appears generally permits a clear distinction

between the two meanings. This study will be concerned with imitation as a principle of composition involving the following of other writers and not with the Aristotelian sense. Further distinctions can be made in the meaning of the word as it applies to composition. As C. S. Baldwin points out, imitation can be of form, of style, or of composition.⁵ Imitation of form involves following another's lead in the writing of orations, letters, dialogues, lyrics, pastorals, or any other classifiable mode of prose or poetry. Imitation of style involves the attempt to emulate one's model by closely following his characteristic rhythm or copying his effects; Ciceronianism in the study of Latin is the foremost example of this kind of imitation. Imitation of composition, Baldwin explains:

Finally, imitation need not be of style; it may be of composition; and for writing addressed to an actual public this is at once more available and more promising. For real writing, that is for a message intended to move the public, imitation generally risks less, and gains more, in guiding the plan, the whole scheme, the sequence.⁶

He further explains, by example, that he means a very general kind of emulation when he speaks of imitation of composition:

But there is no Ciceronianism in Castiglione's adopting the form of Cicero's De oratore for his Cortegiano. Though he naturally shows awareness of Cicero's expert periods, he is bent not on conformity of style, but on focusing the typical man of his own time in the literary frame used by Cicero for the typical Augustan Roman. Renaissance imitation of Vergil's style was often futile; but Tasso's Jerusalem was animated and guided by Vergil's epic sequence. Robert Garnier, imitating the style of Euripides, missed the dramatic composition; but Corneille caught the whole scheme of a Greek tragedy. Such larger imitation imposes no restraint on originality. Its recognition of ancient achievement is in practical adaptation to one's own conception and object and time.⁷

In his concern for demonstrating the classical backgrounds of English literary theory and practice, Baldwin chooses to ignore another kind

of imitation of composition, one much narrower than the grand conceptions of Castiglione, Tasso, and Corneille, but one which was a typically English approach to the idea of imitation of composition, the utilization of contemporary models to adapt to one's own original conception and object. It is this latter kind of imitation of composition and the attempts of the imitator at originality, particularly those attempts resulting in originality of imagery, that are the major concerns of this study.

There can be little doubt that most writers of the English Renaissance, whether or not they were among those who did attempt to discuss imitation as a principle of composition, were aware that they had imitated some other writers. Certainly, if they had discussed the problems of literature as an art with one another, the subject would have frequently been brought up. But, even if they had not, the educational practices of the time would have operated to prepare them to imitate some other author by having made them imitate a number of classical writers from the very beginnings of their formal schooling.

II

As everyone who has thought about education knows, one learns more than subject matter in school. Probably as important as the acquisition of facts is the development of methods of thinking and methods of organizing thoughts. For example, all students of Elizabethan drama are familiar with the theory of memorial reconstruction as one explanation of why some of the quarto editions of Shakespeare's plays differ from the text of the First Folio. Despite

the faultiness of memory which probably explains variations between quarto and folio, many modern students nevertheless are somewhat impressed by the ability of those who remembered long enough to commit to paper, very nearly word for word, approximately two hours of stage traffic. Yet, when one understands that the average grammar school student in sixteenth-century England was subjected to a curriculum which necessitated that he, as a matter of survival, develop his memory so that he could file away and recall on command rather amazing masses of information, it is easy to see how the individual with an exceptional memory further developed by this training could perform feats which seem almost incredible today. John Brinsley, writer on grammar school education and a contemporary of Shakespeare, recommended the practice of memorization for rather young boys: students were to bring short themes they had composed and "the next day at the time appointed for shewing their Theames each one to pronounce his Theame without booke."⁸ Donald Lemen Clark, in reviewing the evidence concerning Milton's education, points out that "memorizing both textbooks and authors was the prevailing method of teaching in the grammar schools."⁹ And Ascham in The Scholemaster paints a vivid picture of the practice of memorization while criticizing it:

I remember, whan I was yong, in the North, they went to the Grammer schole, litle children: they came from thence great lubbers: alwayes learning, and litle profiting: learning without booke, every thing, understanding within the booke, litle or nothing: Their whole knowledge, by learning without the booke, was tied onely to their tong and lips, and never ascended up to the braine and head, and therefore was sone spitte out of the mouth againe.¹⁰

Despite the protest of Elizabeth's tutor, the practice of making

students memorize their lessons persisted in the grammar schools and was, indubitably, a contributing factor in producing the men who were to reconstruct the plays in the print shops.

If the practice of memorization was influential in producing a mind that could readily and easily grasp and recall without effort and with exactness whatever was placed before it, then the practice of imitation in the schools was just as influential in producing a mind that could readily and easily imitate any model set before it. The English school system was admirably suited for providing the kind of training which would insure that the human mind was receptive to the ideas about, and techniques of, imitation suggested by the classical and Renaissance writers, critics, and scholars. One of the most frequently heard modern criticisms of the public schools in America today is that they are too permissive. This was hardly the case in Renaissance England, for there the boy was committed to an educational regimen which, even though it can be described, is almost beyond modern comprehension. And, while it might not have endeared education to its victims, although there is evidence that some nevertheless became enamored of education, there can be little doubt of its efficaciousness in producing minds well prepared by several years of strict and unvarying discipline to analyze literature in a certain way, particularly since the English grammar school education was a literary one.¹¹

In the first form, for example, the child approximately seven or eight years of age began the process which would continue throughout his career in the grammar school. T. W. Baldwin speaks of the authors studied by the young at St. Paul's School:

Their first authors are very "moral," being Sententiae Pueriles, Cato, and Aesop. These were reinforced by their exercises, which consisted principally in turning the Proverbs and Psalms into Latin.¹²

The translation that even the youngest students had to make was probably modeled after Roger Ascham's system of double translation. After the child has learned the parts of speech, Ascham says, the teacher should read to him Cicero's Epistles, explicating the text as he does and translating what he has read into English.

This done thus, let the childe . . . both construe and parse it over againe: so, that it may appeare, that the childe douteth in nothing, that his master taught him before. After this, the childe must take a paper booke, and sitting in some place, where no man shall prompe him, by him self, let him translate into Englishe his former lesson. Then shewing it to his master, let the master take from him his latin booke, and pausing an houre, at the least, then let the childe translate his owne Englishe into latin againe, in an other paper booke.¹³

This method of teaching a child mastery of Latin was recommended by Ascham in his Scholemaster, posthumously published in 1570, but it was obviously the much earlier practice of Ascham, and possibly the practice of other teachers as well, since there were considerably earlier references to double translation.¹⁴

John Brinsley, writing in A Consolation for Our Grammar Schooles fifty-two years later, confirms that the method of double translation had been and should be employed in the schools:

That I do in this worke so much account of Grammaticall translations, . . . I hope that this will be found true by experience, that after children have bene well trained up in their Accidence, and a litle entred and acquainted with them, following the courses directed for them, they will go over their whole Authors so translated, by the help of them, before they could have gone through one third part of them without. And also that they will learne their authors far more perfectly for each good use, and keepe them much more surely, with lesse labour or trouble;

besides that they shall continually learne by them to make Latine truly and purely, and to get matter and phrase, aswell as to construe and parse.¹⁵

These are the practical reasons for translating; one not only learns grammar, syntax, and vocabulary, one learns content and style, and, as a consequence, is introduced to the imagery suggested by the works studied. Brinsley freely admits he is indebted to Ascham for the method of double translation.¹⁶

Like most Englishmen of the period, Brinsley had a veneration for Queen Elizabeth, and this fond respect shows up in the illustration he uses to demonstrate the efficacy of translation as a method of teaching:

By this meanes he saw that experience which might seeme almost incredible, in that hopefull young Gentleman (whose death he so much bewaileth) Maister John Whitney, in Sir Anthony Dennies house, where the Ladie Elizabeth did lye, when he came to serve her; that within lesse then the space of a yeare, he had so profited in writing pure Latine, that (as he saith) some in seven yeares in the Grammar Schooles, yea some in the Universities, could not do halfe so well. So afterwards he saw the like in his happiest Schollar that ever England had bred, our late Queene, who made us all happie; who, as hee saith, did so farre surpasses all of her yeares in excellencie of Learning, and knowledge of divers Tongues, that verie fewe of the rarest wits in the Universities could any way reach unto her. And this seemeth evidently to have bene the chiefe meanes; like as he prooveth at large, by the authoritie of many great learned, this way of translating, to be either the onely, or at least the chiefe, readie, and sure meanes to attaine speedily to any tongue.¹⁷

If translation was good enough for Her Royal Majesty, it should be good enough for anyone, argues Brinsley.

However, even that testimonial could be reinforced by another. Brinsley remembers having spoken to Master Tovey, "who had bene a Schoolmaister, equall . . . to most of the chiefe in that kind,"¹⁸ inquiring about the means by which the latter had succeeded so admirably with a young noble. Tovey answered:

That he had bene enforced to begin againe, even from the verie Accidence, causing him to get the perfect understanding of the Rules, for the meaning and use, though he could not the words in so short a time; and after that, he had caused him to practise continual translating into Latine, after this manner. That he himselve had chosen easie places of Tully, and other familiar Authors, which the Gentleman knew not, and caused him to turne them into Latine, and after brought him to the Author, to compare that which he had written, to the same, just according to this last manner mentioned out of Maister Askam.¹⁹

Tovey, however, is reluctant to take full credit for his pupil's success, for Brinsley reports that after he had explained his method, Tovey "rounding me in the eare . . . said; But shall I tell you, It was by Prayer."²⁰ Without further commentary on the assistance of the Divine in pedagogical matters, Brinsley affirms that translation was his constant practice for more than thirty years of teaching.

The usual result of learning any effective method is the transference of that method from its primary application to other areas. Such, surely, was the case for the method of double translation, as T. W. Baldwin suggests; to the method of construing practiced by Brinsley can be ascribed "a powerful shaping effect . . . upon the pupil's idea of sentence structure."²¹ That is, the individual was influenced to imitate the form of the sentences he was translating. By the same token, Brinsley's method inevitably influenced the pupil to imitate their content and, consequently, their imagery.

Since the students in the first four forms were by their age limited in their abilities, their translations were limited to single sentences. First formers were further handicapped. Although students in the first form were supposed to know how to read and write English before they entered the grammar school, where their main purpose

was to learn Latin, they did not begin writing extensively until the second form. Hence, the first form boys were pretty much limited to oral recitation of their lessons. Nevertheless, the performances of the first form children were sufficient to introduce them to the somewhat related practices of translation and imitation.

Even though he is writing from a point many years after Shakespeare's death, Hoole describes what must have been the time-tested procedure in the first form:

As they learn this book [*Sententiae Pueriles*], let them but take three or four lines at once, which they should,

1. Construe out of Latine into English, and then out of English into Latine.

2. Decline the Nounes and form the Verbs in it throughout, and give the rules for the concordance and construction of the Words.

3. Bring their lessons fair writ out both in English and Latine in a little paper book, which will exceedingly further them in spelling and writing truly.

4. To fix their Lessons the better in their memorie, you may ask them such plain questions, as they can easily answer by the words of a Sentence.

5. Let them also imitate a Sentence sometimes by changing some of the words, and sometimes by altering their Accidents.

6. Give them sometimes the English of a Sentence to make into Latine of themselves, and then let them compare it with the Latine in the book, and see wherein they come short of it, or in what Rule they faile.²²

Earlier in his chapter on the first form, Hoole has outlined what he means by letting the students imitate a sentence:

Let them have so many other examples besides those that are in their book, as may clearly illustrate and evidence the meaning of the Rule, and let them make it wholly their own by practising upon it, either in imitating their present examples or propounding others as plain. Thus that example to the Rule of the first Concord may be first imitated; Praeceptor legit, vos vero negligitis. The Master readeth, and ye regard not. The Pastors preach, and the people regard not. I speak, and ye hear not. We have read, and thou mindest not. And the like may be propounded as, Whilst the

Cat sleepeþ, the Mice dance. When the Master is away the boyes will play. Thou neglectest when I write.²³

Note that the examples of possible variations suggested by Hoole in this passage go beyond the mere imitation of sentence form; Hoole also assumes the student will be able to select appropriate analogical images imitative of those in the original sentence. There is not a very clear distinction between what Hoole calls imitation and the "propounding" of other sentences. It is certain, however, that imitation includes variations and is not restricted to slavish copying of the original. As early as the first year in grammar school, then, the process of indoctrinating students in the methods of imitation was begun.

With a few changes, the second form continued the general pattern introduced in the first. The students were given more opportunity to write; for example, on Monday and Wednesday afternoons they were to be given lessons from that part of the authorized grammar beginning, "Qui mihi, which containeth pretty Precepts of good manners."²⁴ A part of the lesson consisted of an exercise in "true writing": "It were good if they had a little paper-book, wherein to write first the Latine, and then the English Distichs at full length."²⁵ Not only were the students of the grammar school expected to practice translation and imitation in school, they were often given homework. Hoole gives an example of one such exercise:

And that they may now do something of themselves by way of night exercises, let them every evening translate a verse at home out of the 119. Psalm, which I conceive is the most easie for the purpose of making the three Concorde, and some of the more necessary Rules of construction familiar to them. In making their Translations,

1 Let them be sure to write the English very fair and true, observing its just phrases, and let them also make the like notes of distinction in their Latine.

2 When they come to shew their Latines

1st Let one read and construe a verse.

2nd Let another tell you what part of speech every word is, as well English as Latine, and what the English Signes do note.

3rd Let the rest in order give you the right Analysis of every word one by one, and the Rules of Nouns and Verbes, and of Concordance, and Construction.²⁶

These children in the second form, it will be remembered, were usually no older than nine. For this reason Hoole very charitably allowed them to use a glossary of correct words instead of a dictionary, from which they were liable to select the wrong word: "a Dictionary . . . is a great maime and hinderance to them in making Latine (and caused Mr. Ascham to affirm, that making of Latines marreth children)."²⁷ Despite such strictures as are outlined, the method of double translation provided ample opportunities to reinforce what was learned about imitation in the first form.

In the third form the homework continued to be very much the same, except that the student was to translate two verses of Proverbs every night from English into Latin, and two from Latin into English.²⁸ There were other significant changes in the course of study, however. Baldwin shows that Shakespeare knew Aesop's Fables quite well, citing some twenty allusions to the fables as evidence.²⁹ Although there is ample evidence that Shakespeare probably read Aesop in the second form,³⁰ Hoole would have his students read the fables in the third form. Whatever the case for Shakespeare, among the other values of reading Aesop, called by Hoole "a book of great antiquity and of more solid learning than most men think,"³¹ would be its use as a model for imitation:

That they may learn to observe and get the true Latine order of placing words, and the purity of expression either

in English or Latine Style, let them imitate a period or more in a lesson, turning it out of English into Latine, or out of Latine into English. A Cock, as he turned over a dunghill found a pearl, saying, why do I find a thing so bright? And in Latine, Gallus gallinaceus, dum vertit stercorarium offendit gemman; Quid, inquiens, rem sic nitidam reperio? They may imitate it by this or the like expression; As a beggar raked in a dunghill, he found a purse, saying; why do I finde so much money here? Mendicus dum vertit stercorarium, offendit crumenam; quid inquiens, tantum argenti hic reperio?³²

The immediate practical use of this exercise, of course, was to reinforce the students' knowledge of Latin grammar and vocabulary. But indirectly they were being forced to compose variations on a theme.

A better example of this same sort of exercise is added by Hoole. While their forenoon lessons were to be out of Aesop, Mantuan was to be studied by the students on Monday and Wednesday afternoons. Hoole demonstrates how the first Eclogue of Mantuan, "a Poet both for style and matter, very familiar and gratefull to children,"³³ should be used. First he repeats the Latin:

Fauste, precor; gelida quando pecus omne sub umbra
Ruminat, antiquos paulum recitemus amores.
Ne si forte sopor nos occupet ulla ferarum,
Quae modo per segetes tacite insidiantur adultas
Saeviat in pecudes. Melior vigilantia somno.

From these lines the student should make an English imitation:

Shepherds are wont sometimes to talke of their old loves,
whilest the cattel chew the cud under the shade; for fear, if
they should fall asleep, some Fox or Wolf, or such like beast
of prey, which either lurk in the thick woods, or lay wait in
the grown corn, should fall upon the cattel. And indeed,
watching is farre more commendable for a Prince, or Magistrate,
then immoderate, or unseasonable sleep.

Having done violence to the Latin, the child can then, without reference to the original lines, turn his English imitation back into Latin:

Pastores aliquando dum pecus sub umbra ruminat, antiquos suas amores recitare solent; ne, si soper ipsos occupet, vulpes, aut lupus, aut aliqua eius generis fera praedabunda, quae vel in densis sylvis latitant, vel per adultas segetes insidiatur, in pecudes saeviat; Imo enimvero, Principi vel Magistratui vigilantia somno immodico ac intempestivo multo laudabilior est.³⁴

This exercise as outlined by Hoole is an adaptation of the method of double translation, differing from it in that the first step, from Latin to English, was an imitation instead of a literal translation; however, the second step, from English to Latin, was a translation. Of especial interest is the encouragement of the student's originality. While the subject of the imitation is essentially the same as that of the original, the imagery has been varied with a resulting shift in meaning and tone best exemplified by the contrast between "Melior vigilantia somno" and "watching is farre more commendable for a Prince, or Magistrate, then immoderate, or unseasonable sleep."

As if the students did not have enough to tax their resources, Hoole suggests one further exercise for the third form. On Tuesday and Thursday afternoons students were to read the Colloquies of Helvicius, afterward construing the selection read. Hoole advises the teacher to "cause them sometimes to imitate a whole Colloquie, or a piece of one."³⁵ In this way, so Hoole thought, the students would become more fluent in their Latin. They would also become adept at translating, not word for word, but with variations, and these translations were almost synonymous to what Hoole considered imitation to be, at least in the early forms. Before a child left the lower grammar school, Hoole would, in fact, have him be tested

on his ability to translate "by causing him to turn an English into Latine in imitation of . . . [a] Fable."³⁶

By the time, then, the student in an English grammar school was approximately eleven years old he would have been, according to Hoole's ideals, exposed to three or four years of education which, among other things, had begun to lead him to think and write in certain imitative patterns which were themselves designed to enable his imagination to see the possibilities inherent in variation on a theme.

In the upper grammar school the study of Terence was begun. The Roman playwright would provide many notable and realistic models for the student, for in Terence the student "may observe many remarkable things, sayings, and actions, which will hint much to abundant matter of invention for future exercises."³⁷ Hoole recounts a number of sentences which can be found in Terence and comments that "such Dictates as these, the Master may give his Scholars sometimes to turn into pure Latine, till they be able to make the like themselves."³⁸ Again, emphasis on learning composition by imitation is the implication of this statement.³⁹

The student also begins to develop the Ciceronian style through the study of Cicero's Epistles. Hoole remarks that he prefers the edition of Sturm, the contemporary of Ascham who possibly was the greatest Protestant scholar of his time. The method of study Hoole suggests is "the way Mr. Brinsley so much commendeth, and Mr. Ascham was moved to think to be onely, or chiefly the fittest, for the speedy and perfect attaining of the Tongue."⁴⁰ This, of course, was double translation; and, as if he had not before, Hoole again outlines the method:

I would have them be exercised in double translating these Epistles, so as to render many of them into good English, and after a while to turn the same again into Latine, and to try how near they can come to their Authour in the right choice, and orderly placing of words in every distinct period.⁴¹

Should the student not be familiar with Cicero, Hoole would have him translate, literally, a hundred epistles selected from those of Cicero and others:

Then do I cause them . . . to make double translations of themselves; one while writing down both the English and Latine together, as they construe it . . . and another while, and most frequently, writing English out of the Latine by it selfe, which within ten dayes after, they try how to turn into the like good Latine again.⁴²

Once the student had proved his proficiency at double translation, he would then be exercised by writing letters to his friends in imitation of the models in Cicero's Epistles. Hoole illustrates this procedure at length, advising his reader that "you may shew them how to imitate it [the model]." And "they may imitate the same Epistle again in framing an answer to the particulars of the foregoing letter after this manner; observing the form of composition, rather than the words."⁴³ In this way one form was made to serve for many separate letters, but the student was further encouraged not to copy slavishly Cicero's vocabulary:

Thus you may help them to take so much as is needfull and fit for their purpose out of any Epistle, and to alter and apply it fitly to their several occasions of writing to their several friends; and where Tully's expressions will not serve them, let them borrow words and phrases out of the books that they have learnt, (but especially out of Terence) and take care to place them so, that they may continually seem to imitate Tullie's form of writing Epistles, though they be not altogether tyed to his very words.⁴⁴

Quite obviously, if the student was "not altogether tyed" to

Cicero's words, he was very likely to vary the imagery of the letter he was imitating and, indeed, was encouraged to do so. Although a warning was issued against license in the use of the Latin vocabulary, it was meant to stifle ignorance of proper usage rather than the imagination of the user.

Hoole concludes his discussion of the way in which Cicero's Epistles might be used by outlining a method in which the whole class together could benefit from the imitation of the model. The results of the class method are identical with those he has already pointed out: "And thus you shall finde the same Epistle varied so many several wayes, that every boy will seem to have an Epistle of his own, and quite differing in words from all those of his fellowes, though the matter be one and the same."⁴⁵ That is, each of the epistles written by the individual members of the class will be an original work, even though all were modeled in form and subject on one of Cicero's. Implicit in these remarks is the idea that originality can result from imitation. The subject of each of the many letters resulting from the collective imitation of one of Cicero's Epistles would in every case be the same, but each would be different in that each student would have worded his letter as he chose. The obvious consequence of this freedom in the choice of words and phrases would be a significant variation in meaning, tone, and imagery.

Poetry was also useful for grammatical purposes, and the student was first introduced to Ovid in the Latin, not for the sake of Ovid, but because he provided a useful model for Latin prosody. Thus, the main reason for reading Ovid was "the scanning and proving

[of] verses."⁴⁶ So that the student might be given opportunity to show any inclination he had toward poetry, Hoole would prepare him for its composition by allowing him also to read translations of Mantuan and Virgil, as well as certain English poets.⁴⁷ Other English poets might be added to the list so long as the teacher selected "none which are stuff't with drollary or ribauldry, which are fitter to be burnt, then to be sent abroad to corrupt good manners in youth."⁴⁸

Once his reading had provided the student with some knowledge of prosody, he was allowed to demonstrate his poetic powers:

After they are thus become acquainted with variety of meeter, you can cause them to turn a Fable of Aesop into what kinde of verse you please to appoint them; and sometimes you may let them translate some select Epigrams out of Owen, or those collected by Mr. Farnaby or some Emblemes out of Alciat, or the like Flourishes of wit which you think will more delight them and help their fansies. And when you see they begin to exercise their own wits for enlargement, and invention, you may leave them to themselves, to make verse on any occasion of subject.⁴⁹

Here the method of imitation is again used to prepare the student for the composition of poetry. However, it must be remembered that the underlying reason for all these exercises was to increase the student's fluency in Latin, and, after he had learned Latin prosody and tasted "the sweetnesse of poetizing in English,"⁵⁰ he was to be prepared for writing Latin verses. The exercise Hoole suggests would best prepare the student is setting him to explore the variations possible in one or two lines of verse. By way of illustration, Hoole cites two examples; the first, he says, can be varied 104 ways, the second, 450 ways.⁵¹

Following these exercises the student returned to the study of Ovid for the remainder of the year, but he did not escape translation

and variation. In addition to the grammatical approach to Ovid, Hoole once more recommends exercises aimed at increasing the student's ability to translate:

Let them strive (who can best) to turn the Fable into English prose, and to adorn and amplifie it with fit Epithetes, choice Phrases, acute Sentences, wittie Apophthegmes, livelie similitudes, pat examples, and Proverbial Speeches, all agreeing to the matter of moralitie therein couched; all which they should divide into several Periods, and return into proper Latine, rightlie placed according to the Rules of Rhetorical composition.

Let them exercise their wits a little in trying who can turn the same into most varietie of English verse.⁵²

The goal of this exercise, to make the student more adept at translation, was probably achieved, but it should be noted that the exercise would also operate to strengthen further the principles of imitative composition already suggested to the student.

To summarize, the upper grammar school, together with other subjects, prepared its first-year students in three authors, Cicero, Terence, and Ovid. In exercises based on all three the student found it necessary to imitate and translate, and was given more than ample opportunity to develop any talent he might have for these skills. The lower grammar school forms had previously prepared the pupil for these latest steps, although he was for the first time to practice translation and imitation extensively.

Since he is more interested in Greek and Hebrew in the fifth form and beyond, Hoole pays less attention to the teaching of Latin. Nevertheless, there are some further instructions given which make it clear that the student continued throughout his final two forms in grammar school to practice imitation, which was, for that matter, the way the student also learned Greek and Hebrew. Fifth formers were to read Virgil, and

As they read this Author, you may cause them sometimes to relate a pleasing story in good English prose, and to try who can soonest turn it into elegant Latine, or into some other kinde of verses which you please for the present to appoint them, either English or Latine or both.⁵³

Sixth formers were to read Lucan, Seneca, Martiall, "and the rest of the finest Latine Poets" so that they might learn "how and wherein they may imitate them, or borrow something out of them."⁵⁴

Of particular interest here is the suggestion that the student imitate matter but not form, since it is just this transference of matter from one literary form to the other that is analogous to Shakespeare's use of his sources in the plays which are the concern of this study. The rigor of verse argues that, even had he wanted to, the student who attempted to carry out this assignment very likely was unable to preserve intact the imagery of the original.

Also of great interest are the instructions Hoole gives concerning the teaching of rhetoric, for rhetorical methods laid the foundation for most future composition the student was apt to attempt. The student was to translate Cicero's Paradoxes "and pronounce them also in English and Latine as if they were" his own.⁵⁵ Finishing this particular work of Cicero, he was next to turn to other Latin orations:

And of these I would have them constantly to translate one every day into English, beginning with those that are the shortest, and once a week to strive amongst themselves, who can best pronounce them both in English and Latine. . . . I have experienced it to be a most effectual means to draw on my Scholars to emulate one another, who could make the best exercises of their own in the most Rhetorical style, and have often seen the most bashfull, and least promising boyes, to out-strip their fellows in pronouncing with a courage, and comely gesture. . . . I found nothing that I did formerly to put such spirit into my scholars, and make them, like so many Nightingales, to contend, who could *μαλισταλιγελω*

most melodiously tune his voyce and frame style, to pronounce and imitate the forementioned Orations.⁵⁶

Of interest is the emphasis on competition, and on delivery. Still, the major result of such exercises would be to teach the patterns of thought and organization of material. Whatever else the student was being taught, he was being taught to imitate, and the variations on the original surely included variations on the imagery of the original.

Another of the fifth-form exercises, the weekly theme, operated not only further to exercise the student in the method of imitation, but also to provide him with a stock of matter, such as information, conceits, devices, and images, from which he could draw for the rest of his life. The student prepared by copying in a commonplace book materials from his reading which might be useful, after which he was given a theme. He was first to consult his commonplace book in class, copying down all that others had written on the subjects suggested by the theme and reading his quotations. All students, by this practice, would "alwayes have store of matter for invention ready at hand, which is far beyond what their own wit is able to conceive."⁵⁷ They were also to consult whatever sources were available to them in the school library. That the student would, of course, be expected to imitate form as well as matter is made clear by Hoole's recommendation of a number of suitable books, both English and Latin, in which the students would "learne how to prosecute the severall parts of a Theme more at large . . . to bring their matter into handsome and plain order; and to flourish and adorne it neatly with Rhetorical Tropes and Figures . . . according to the best of their Authours."⁵⁸

- Once the student had done all this, the teacher should propound a Theme [to his students] in English and Latine, and let them strive who can soonest return you the best Exordium in English, and then who can render it into the best Latine, and so you may proceede to the narration, and quite thorow every part of a Theme, not tying them to the words of any Authour, but giving them liberty to contract, or enlarge, or alter them as they please; so that they still contend to go beyond them in purity of expression. This being done, you may dismisse them to adventure to make every one his own exercises in English and Latine and to bring it fair written, and be able to pronounce it distinctly memoriter at a time appointed. And when once you see they have gained a perfect way of making Themes of themselves, you may let them go on to attain the habit by their own constant practice, ever and anon minding them what places in their Authours (as they read) are most worthy notice and imitation, and for what purposes they may serve them.⁵⁹

Hoole here emphasizes the liberating power of imitation, urging that a student should compete with his model in the hope of surpassing him "in purity of expression."

Not only were the fifth formers schooled in the usual subject matter of rhetoric, they were also set to putting what they had been taught earlier about poetry into use by writing verse. First they were recommended certain texts in which they would find patterns "for invention of further matter upon any occasion or subject they are to treat upon."⁶⁰ But these texts were incidental to Ovid and Virgil, the ultimate models for emulation:

But for gaining a smooth way of versifying, and to be able to express much matter in few words, and very fully to the life, I conceive it very necessary for Scholars to be very frequent in perusing and rehearsing Ovid and Virgil. . . . And the Master indeed should cause his Scholars to recite a piece of Ovid or Virgil, in his hearing now and then, that the very tune of these pleasant verses may be imprinted in their mindes, so that when ever they are put to compose a verse, they make it glide as even [as] those in their Authours.⁶¹

Although this commentary is indicative of the high esteem Hoole has

for Virgil and Ovid, an opinion shared almost universally by the learned during the English Renaissance, he is not so prescriptive as to exclude all other poets. He admits that students might gain from reading "such kind of Poets, as they are themselves delighted with all, either for more variety of verse, or the wittinesse of conceit sake."⁶²

The students were to continue composition of prose and verse in the sixth form and, in addition, the students of the sixth form were encouraged to continue competing with each other:

They should often also vie wits amongst themselves, and strive who can make the best Anagrams, Epigrams, Epitaphes, Epithalamia, Eclogues, Acrosticks, and golden verses, English, Latine, Greek, and Hebrew; which they will easily do after a while, having good patterns before them to imitate, which they may collect out of Authours, as they fansie them, for their own use and delight.⁶³

The wit combats which take place between Shakespearian characters were obviously anticipated by those between students, and, even if these intellectual jousts cannot be solely ascribed to pedagogical practice, there can be no doubt that the practice of the schools at least prepared a part of the audience to accept and enjoy them, just as the necessity to accumulate a store of quotations and imitate in various forms prepared authors for the kind of imitation they were to present to their audiences.

Hoole is useful to us because of his methodical exposition. No innovator, he was describing an ancient plan, even in some details unchanged from the days of Henry VIII. Of course, Shakespeare was not taught by Hoole nor is it possible even to say with certainty that Shakespeare had a grammar school education. T. W. Baldwin, in the conclusion to his monumental study of English education during

the latter half of the sixteenth century and its relation to Shakespeare's works, chooses to conclude only that it was highly probable the playwright did attend the grammar school at Stratford:

The evidence appears to be conclusive that Shakspeare had such knowledge and techniques as grammar school was calculated to give. We have no direct evidence that he ever attended any grammar school a single day. . . . Those nearest the time either knew or assumed that Shakspeare had attended the grammar school at Stratford. It is reasonably certain that he did attend school there for some period of time. The internal evidence and such external evidence as survives conspire together to indicate that Shakspeare pretty certainly had at Stratford the benefits of the complete grammar school curriculum.⁶⁴

Professor Baldwin is also uncertain about the exact nature of the course of study at Stratford, for direct evidence about that is likewise lacking.⁶⁵ However, it seems reasonable to assume that it was something similar to what has been outlined. Indeed, Hoole's modern editor, Thiselton Mark, comments that in 1912 there were "some comparatively young men still living who had to learn" parts of the Latin grammar in exactly the same way that the seventeenth-century pedagogue recommended it be taught.⁶⁶ And while Baldwin did discern a shift in emphasis in the grammar school curriculum which was completed by the eighteenth century, he felt that Hoole, despite the concentration on system and method, still presented what was essentially the only course of study during the sixteenth century:

Thus, Hoole's upper school follows for Latin the regular sequences which had been provided in the sixteenth century. Hoole has emphasized the transition from lower school to upper school, and has differentiated meticulously the upper forms. But all this is, so far as external form is concerned, a mere tidying up of the sixteenth century system.⁶⁷

It is precisely Hoole's devotion to outlining in some detail the systems and methods of instruction in the grammar schools which make

him valuable to this study, for these methods of instruction reveal the extent to which the grammar school student was instructed in imitative methods, methods that often invited the student to alter the imagery of that which he imitated.

Furthermore, it can be assumed with some assurance that the lessons learned about imitation carried over into the later lives of the students, particularly those whose vocation or avocation was literature. T. W. Baldwin, in the case of Shakespeare, cites the numerous allusions to the classical writers in the works as evidence of the probability that Shakespeare read these authors in grammar school. While no such wealth of internal evidence exists to support the contention that Shakespeare was familiar with the practice of imitation, H. O. White has discovered a few instances which illustrate some knowledge of the practice. Most of these are derisive of uninspired imitation. Berowne in Love's Labor's Lost argues against Ferdinand's proposal that the nobles of Navarre withdraw from the world by commenting,

Small have continual plodders ever won,
Save base authority from others' books. 68

Berowne's scorn for scholarship is repeated again when he expresses his contempt for Boyet:

This fellow pecks up wit as pigeons pease,
And utters it again when God doth please. 69

White also points out that the role of Holofernes, the schoolmaster, is obviously meant to satirize academic imitation. Certainly, the things Holofernes says are illustrative of the methods of Hoole. Responding to Nathaniel's compliment on his ability to compose an "extemporal epitaph," the pedant modestly says,

This is a gift that I have, simple, simple; a foolish extravagant spirit, full of forms, figures, shapes, objects, ideas, apprehensions, motions, revolutions. These are begot in the ventricle of memory, nourish'd in the womb of pia mater, and delivered upon the mellowing of occasion.⁷⁰

Here is application of the type of imitative composition that enabled students "upon fit occasion or subject, to compose a handsome"⁷¹ verse, the result of "perusing and excerpting passages that may serve for their occasions out of . . . moderne Orators, whose eloquence we admire."⁷² A few lines later Holofernes is asked to read a letter; before he begins he again displays his learning:

Fauste, precor, gelida quando pecus omne sub umbra
Ruminat, and so forth. Ah, good old Mantuan! I may
speak of thee as the traveller doth of Venice:

Venetia, Venetia,
Chi non ti vede, non ti pretia.

Old Mantuan! old Mantuan! Who understandeth thee not, loves
thee not.⁷³

In these lines there occur two of the subjects about which Hoole speaks. The first, interestingly, is Holofernes' repetition of the opening line of the first Eclogue of Mantuan, the exact example used by Hoole to demonstrate how that poet could be approached in the classroom.⁷⁴ The second is Holofernes' own demonstration of the way in which variations on irrelevant lines of verse could be turned to the speaker's use. What is risible here is not the inappropriateness of the comparison of Venice to Mantuan, but the recognition by the audience that Holofernes was engaged in a typical pedagogical practice.

Part of Berowne's poem is read to Holofernes, and again the schoolteacher's reactions are typical:

You find not the apostrophas, and so miss the accent. Let
me supervise the canzonet. Here are only numbers ratified;

but for the elegancy, facility, and golden cadence of poesy, caret. Ovidius Naso was the man. And why indeed "Naso," but for smelling out the odoriferous flowers of fancy, the jerks of invention? Imitari is nothing. So doth the hound his master, the ape his keeper, the tired horse his rider.⁷⁵

This criticism by Holofernes acknowledges the mechanical correctness of the poem he has just been read, but denies that it is the work of a natural poet. The poem is nothing but an imitation of the basest sort, containing little or nothing original. Internal evidence of this type suggests very strongly that Shakespeare had an intimate knowledge of the subjects and methods of instruction taught in the grammar school.⁷⁶

III

But, even if a writer had never attended grammar school, he could hardly have escaped some discussion of imitation as a principle of composition, for the subject was constantly being talked about. Sidney was one early commentator. Another was King James VI of Scotland.

White points out that King James apparently condemns imitation when he says, "Ye man also be warre with composing ony thing in the same maner as hes bene ower oft usit of before."⁷⁷ The remainder of this passage, however, makes it very clear that the Scottish king meant that one should be original in the way one used the language. To imitate a subject was quite all right.⁷⁸ In speaking of one's love, the writer must be cautious about describing his love's beauty lest he repeat the words of others. Similarly, he must exercise caution when, at the beginning of a poem, he describes the morning sunrise, "for thir thingis are sa oft and

dyverslie writtin upon be Poëtis already, that gif ye do the lyke it will appeare ye bot imitate, and that it cummis not of your awin Iventioun, quhilk is ane of the cheif properteis of ane Poete."⁷⁹

Invention, at least to King James VI, applies not to the choice of subject matter; the question of originality is settled by the imagery a poet uses. To invent is to seek new ways to express the universals of human experience; the universals are beyond invention. Of King James, White says:

The Essays of a Prentice in the Divine Art of Poesy (1584), the volume of King James's poems to which his treatise was appended, indicates on every page either that the royal poet found it easier to teach "the docile bairns of knowl-edge" than to follow his own instruction, or that he meant "find" rather than "fabricate" when he wrote, "it is best that ye invent your awin subject your self."⁸⁰

That King James did not mean fabricate is made even more clear by his Sonnet Decifring The Perfyte Poete:

Ane rype ingyne, ane quick and walkned witt,
With somhair reasons, suddenlie applyit,
For every purpose using reasons fitt,
With skilfulnes, where learning may be spyit,
With pithie wordis, for to expres yow by it
His full intention in his proper leid,
The puritie quhairof weill hes he tryit,
With memorie to keip quhat he dois reid,
With skilfulnes and figuris, quhilks proceid
From Rhetorique, with everlasting fame,
With others wounding, preassing with all speid
For to attaine to merite sic a name:
All thir into the perfyte Poëte be.
Goddis, grant I may obtaine the Laurell trie."⁸¹

Ingenuity is necessary for the poet, but so is rhetoric and study, for the poet's job is to express learning with pithy words. Nowhere does King James lay down any strictures on drawing from other's matter. To be sure, he says, "Bot sen Invention is ane of the cheif vertewis in a Poete, it is best that ye invent your awin subject your self, and not to compose of sene subjectis."⁸² Yet just before

he writes these words he gives instructions which make it clear what he means by "subject." One subject may be "to prayse your Love," another may be "sic as ye man speik some thing of the morning or Sunne rysing." Neither suggests that the poet should not imitate others in the material he chooses to imitate; rather he is clearly suggesting that the poet's approach to the material be original.

William Webbe's "A Discourse of English Poetrie" is another source of evidence that imitation was an accepted practice in composition. Webbe's very lack of originality testifies to the currency of the doctrine. Poetry, called by Webbe the sister of rhetoric, needs reformation in England, particularly in regard to prosody, and Webbe sets himself to this task. Like others, he follows Horace, calls poetry an art,⁸³ and cites Cicero as saying "that a Poet cannot expresse verses abundantly, sufficiently, and fully, neither his eloquence can flowe pleasauntly, or his wordes sounde well and plenteously, without celestiaall instinction."⁸⁴ But Webbe indicates how that "celestiaall instinction" is to be applied when, in offering Spenser's words as evidence of poets recognizing the need for inspiration, he describes the author of The Shepheardes Calender as one

whose fine poeticall witt and most exquisite learning, as he shewed abundantly in that peece of worke, in my judgment inferiour to the workes neither of Theocritus in Greeke nor Virgill in Latine, whom he narrowly immitateth.⁸⁵

The poet may be inspired, but he nevertheless imitates.

Thomas Nash, in his preface to Greene's Menaphon, suggests the part imitation was playing in dramatic composition by 1589. Early in the preface he attacks academic dramatists and their

translations of classical plays on the grounds that they are corrupting the English language by introducing in these plays an inkhorn eloquence which audience and actors mistakenly accept as the best English:

I am not ignorant how eloquent our gowned age is grown of late, so that everie moechanicall mate abhorres the english he was borne too, and plucks with a solemne periphrasis his ut vales from the inkhorne: which I impute not so much to the perfection of arts as to the servile imitation of vain-glorious tragoedians, who contend not so seriouslie to excell in action as to embowell the clowdes in a speach of comparison; thinking themselves more than initiated in poets immortalitye if they but once get Boreas by the beard, and the heavenlie bull by the deaw-lap. But herein I cannot so fully bequeath them to follie, as their idiote art-masters, that intrude themselves to our eares as the alcumists of eloquence, who (mounted on the stage of arrogance) think to outbrave better pens with the swelling bumbast of a bragging blanke verse.⁸⁶

Included among these defilers of the well of English are Greene's critics.

The academicians are also responsible for the efforts of the less literate to capitalize on the popularity of bombastic classical imagery:

It is a common practise now a daies amongst a sort of shifting companions, that runne through every arte and thrive by none, to leave the trade of Noverint, whereto they were borne, and busie themselves with the indeavors of Art, that could scarcelie latinize their necke-verse if they should have neede; yet English Seneca read by candle light yeldes manie good sentences, as Bloud is a begger, and so foorth; and, if you intreate him faire in a frostie morning, he will affoord you whole Hamlets, I should say handfulls of tragical speeches.⁸⁷

But even the rich vein of classical literature is not inexhaustible:

But O grieffe! tempus edax rerum, what's that will last alwaies? The sea exhaled by droppes will in continuance be drie, and Seneca let bloud line by line and page by page at length must needes die to our stage: which makes his famisht followers to imitate the Kidde in Aesop, who, enamored with the Foxes newfangles, forsooke all hopes of life

to leape into a new occupation, and these men, renouncing all possibilities of credit or estimation, to intermeddle with Italian translations.⁸⁸

Nash's comment demonstrates many of the playwrights were quick to adapt imitative methods to practical exigencies, despite the misgivings of those who measured excellence with a classical yardstick. The next step was to be the imitation of English works.

Nash, in the course of praising Greene for his originality, is harshly critical of a slavish kind of imitation which has not progressed beyond that taught in the classroom and which dams the flow of creativity:

Let other men . . . praise the mountaine that in seaven yeares brings foorth a mouse, or the Italianate pen that of a packet of pilfries affoordeth the presse a pamphlet or two in an age, and then in disguised arraie vaunts Ovids and Plutarchs plumes as their owne.⁸⁹

There is no reason why such imitations should be so highly praised; such contemporary authors, Nash asserts, may best be characterized as plagiarists:

Indeede, I must needes say the descending yeares from the Philosophers Athens have not been supplied with such present Orators as were able in anie English vaine to be eloquent of their owne, but either they must borrow invention of Ariosto and his Countreyemen, take up choyce of words by exchange in Tullies Tusculane and the Latine Historiographers store-houses, similitudes, nay whole sheetes and tractacts verbatim, from the plentie of Plutarch and Plinie, and, to conclude, their whole methode of writing from the libertie of Comical fictions that have succeeded to our Rethoritians by a second imitation: so that well may the Adage, Nil dictum quod non dictum prius, bee the most judiciall estimate of our latter Writers.⁹⁰

Despite the tenor of these remarks, it is important to remember that they were not directed against the original kind of imitation, not even against translation, nor against rhetoric. For example, Nash lauds scholars and translators such as Ascham, Grindal, Erasmus,

Elyot, Moore, and others who "have, either by their private readings or publique workes, repurged the errors of Arts expelde from their puritie, and set before our eyes a more perfect Methode of Studie."⁹¹ Art, which involved the use of imitation and other areas of rhetoric, was not at fault; indeed, "amongst all the ornaments of Artes, Rethorick is to be had in highest reputation, without the which all the rest are naked."⁹² The vices of art stem from the artist rather than from the art, and those who would censure art because of faults they see in study are simply attributing the practices of the artist to his art. "There is no such discredit of Arte as an ignoraunt Artificer,--men of meaner judgement measuring oft times the excellencie of the one by the ignorance of the other."⁹³ The point Nash is really concerned with is that Greene is the victim of "men of meaner judgement" whose work shows them to be ignorant artificers and therefore in no position to judge. As White makes quite clear, evidence drawn from the body of Nash's work shows him to be an enemy not of imitation, but of imitation wrongly practiced.⁹⁴

George Puttenham, in "The Arte of English Poesie," reflects the ambiguity of meaning the word "imitation" had during the Renaissance. To Puttenham, one who imitates might be a person who was emulating forms introduced into literature by the Greeks, Romans, and French:

So have we remembred and set forth to your Majestie very briefly all the commended fourmes of the auncient Poesie, which we in our vulgare makings do imitate and use under these common names: enterlude, song, ballade, carroll, and ditty; borrowing them also from the French, al saving this word "song" which is our naturall Saxon English word: the rest, such as time and usurpation by custome have allowed us out of the primitive Greeke & Latine, as Comedie, Tragedie, Ode, Epitaphe, Elegie, Epigramme, and other moe.⁹⁵

Or one who imitates could be a person who was following the moral precepts set forth by classical poets Puttenham identifies as

Mimistes:

There were others that for the peoples good instruction, and triall of their owne witts, used in places of great assembly to say by rote nombers of short and sententious meetres, very pithie and of good edification, and thereupon were called Poets Mimistes, as who would say, imitable and meet to be followed for their wise and grave lessons.⁹⁶

Or, finally, he might be an artist engaged in the practice Aristotle called mimesis:

In another respect we say arte is neither an aider nor a surmounter but onely a bare immitatour of natures works, following and counterfeyting her actions and effects, as the Marmesot doth many countenances and gestures of man; of which sorte are the artes of painting and kerving.⁹⁷

It is this latter kind of imitation to which Puttenham alludes when he writes:

And nevertheless, without any repugnancie at all, a Poet may in some sort be said a follower or imitator, because he can expresse the true and lively of every thing is set before him, and which he taketh in hand to describe: and so in that respect is both a maker and a counterfaior: and Poesie an art not only of making, but also of imitation.⁹⁸

Among his other concerns, Puttenham is interested in delineating the true poet, and ideally that individual ought not to be any sort of imitator other than the kind outlined above. The opening words of his book emphasize the role of the poet as the wholly original creator:

A Poet is as much to say as a maker. And our English name well conformes with the Greeke word. . . . Such as . . . we may say of God; who without any travell to his divine imagination made all the world of nought, nor also by any paterne or mould, as the Platonicks with their Idees do phantastically suppose. Even so the very Poet makes and contrives out of his owne braine both the verse and matter of his poeme, and not by any foreine copie or example, as doth the translator, who therefore may well be sayd a versifier, but not a Poet.⁹⁹

By Puttenham's definition, none who practiced the imitative method of composition could be called poet.

Puttenham, as his use of the word "imitation" and his admission of the necessity of mimesis indicate, was not as rigorous as his definition; and another point of confusion arises when he fails to distinguish between the ideal poet described above and those who have been called poets in the past. Preparing to compliment his queen, he classifies poets:

It is therefore of Poets thus to be conceived, that if they be able to devise and make all these things of them selves, without any subject of veritie, that they be (by maner of speech) as creating gods. If they do it by instinct divine or naturall, then surely much favoured from above; if by their experience, then no doubt very wise men; if by any president or paterne layd before them, then trully the most excellent imitators & counterfaiors of all others.¹⁰⁰

The order of classification is descending: the creating gods, the divinely blessed, the wise, and the imitators. Poets who are imitators, even though the worst of poets, are the "most excellent" of all other imitators, whose ranks include painters and carvers.

Having established the distinction between makers and imitators, Puttenham now compliments Elizabeth. She is both:

But you (Madame) my most Honored and Gracious, if I should seeme to offer you this my devise for a discipline and not a delight, I might well be reputed of all others the most arrogant and injurious, your selfe being alreadye, of any that I know in our time, the most excellent Poet; forsooth by your Princely purse, favours, and countenance, making in maner what ye list, the poore man rich, the lewd well learned, the coward courageous, and vile both noble and valiant: then for imitation no lesse, your person as a most cunning counterfaior lively representing Venus in countenance, in life Diana, Pallas for governement, and Juno in all honour and regall magnificence.¹⁰¹

Obviously, Elizabeth's imitation is not that of the translator, but that of the artist who is able to recreate what is in nature.

Puttenham's insistence on the originality of the true poet leads him either to neglect any discussion of imitation, as in his survey of the verse forms of the Greeks, Romans, and French, or to redefine an imitative practice in such a way that it no longer constitutes imitation. Although, he claims, verbal ability is a function of natural instinct, education, which it will be remembered relied heavily on imitative methods, could be of use to the poet. However, education according to Puttenham was not really imitative:

I call those artes of Grammer, Logicke, and Rhetorick, not bare imitations . . . but by long and studious observation rather a repetition or reminiscens naturall, reduced into perfection, and made prompt by use and exercise. And so whatsoever a man speakes or perswades he doth it not by imitation artificially, but by observation naturally (though one follow another), because it is both the same and the like that nature doth suggest.¹⁰²

On the other hand, Puttenham's insistence on originality does not blind him to the contribution of many earlier English poets, even when he considers them translators or their work translations. Of Chaucer he says, "though many of his bookes be but bare translations out of the Latin & French, yet are they wel handled, as his bookes of Troilus and Cresseid, and the Romant of the Rose."¹⁰³ Lydgate, however, is a "translatour onely, and no deviser of that which he wrate, but one that wrate in good verse."¹⁰⁴ And Puttenham also commends Phaer and Golding "for a learned and well corrected verse, specially in translation cleare and very faithfully answering their authours intent."¹⁰⁵ These and others are cited by Puttenham as writers whose

names should not be defrauded of such honour as seemeth due to them for having by their thankefull studies so much beautified our English tong as at this day it will be found our nation is in nothing inferiour to the French or Italian for copie of language, subtiltie of device, good method and

proportion in any forme of poeme, but that they may compare with the most, and perchance passe a great many of them.¹⁰⁶

His attitude was not as benevolent, however, toward all he called translators. One of his chief concerns is a description of figurative speech, one of the areas wherein the poet should be original. Discussing foreign terms, Puttenham shows how an unidentified writer allowed himself to be discovered guilty of plagiarism:¹⁰⁷

Another of reasonable good facilitie in translation finding certaine of the hymnes of Pyndarus and of Anacreons odes and other Lirickes among the Greekes very well translated by Rounsard the French Poet . . . comes our minion and translates the same out of French into English . . . but doth so impudently robbe the French Poet both of his prayse and also of his French termes, that I cannot so much pitie him as be angry with him for his injurious dealing . . . [he] makes his vaunt that never English finger but his hath toucht Pindars string, which was nevertheless word by word as Rounsard had said before by like braggery. . . . This man deserves to be enited of pety larceny for pilfering other mens devises from them & converting them to his owne use, for in deede as I would wish every inventour, which is the very Poet, to receive the prayses of his invention, so would I not have a translatur to be ashamed to be acknowen of his translation.¹⁰⁸

Again Puttenham takes this opportunity to distinguish between the true poet and the translator, and, for that matter, the literary thief. He does make it clear that the translator's occupation is in no way a dishonorable one; it is, however, distinguishable from that of a poet.

Like Nash, Puttenham prizes originality in the poet above all other qualities, and his insistence on the distinction between the poet who imitated only insofar as he copied nature and the translator who imitated closely the words, and consequently the imagery, of a work written in some other language would have made no sense in a literary world ignorant of the imitative method of composition.

Puttenham's words caused some consternation in literary circles, for Sir John Harington, provoked by the distinctions among poets Puttenham makes, answers him in his preface to his translation of Ariosto's Orlando Furioso (1591). Harington says that his purpose is not

to trouble you with the curious definitions of a Poet and Poesie, & with the subtill distinctions of their sundrie kinds; nor to dispute how high and supernatural the name of a Maker is, so christned in English by that unknowne God-father that this last yeare save one, viz. 1589, set forth a booke called the Art of English Poetrie: and least of all do I purpose to bestow any long time to argue whether Plato, Zenophon, and Erasmus writing fictions and Dialogues in prose may justly be called Poets, or whether Lucan writing a story in verse be an historiographer, or whether Master Faire translating Virgil, Master Golding translating Ovids Metamorphosis, and my selfe in this worke that you see, be any more then versifiers, as the same Ignoto termeth all translators.¹⁰⁹

The tone of Harington's words suggests that, insofar as he is concerned, all the writers he mentions, himself included, "may justly be called Poets."

That imitation as a principle of composition was practiced and recognized as such is evidenced by Harington's defense of Ariosto's poem. He begins his defense by noting similarities between Ariosto and a universally approved poem:

I will make choise of some other Poeme that is allowed and approved by all men, and a litle compare them together. And what worke can serve this turne so fitly as Virgils Aeneados, whom above all other it seemeth my authour doth Follow, as appeares both by his beginning and ending? The tone begins,

Arma virumque cano.

The tother,

Le donne, i cavallier, l'arme, gli amori,
Le cortesie, l'audaci imprese io canto.

Virgill endes with the death of Turnus,

Vitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras.

Ariosto ends with the death of Rodomont,

Bestemmiando fuggi l'alma sdegnosa,
Che fu sì altera al mondo, e sì orgogliosa.

Virgill extolled Aeneas to please Augustus, of whose race he was thought to come; Ariosto prayeth Rogero to the honour of the house of Este: Aeneas hath his Dido that retaineth him; Rogero hath his Alcina: finally, least I should note every part, there is nothing of any speciall observation in Virgill but my author hath with great felicitie imitated it. ¹¹⁰

As can be seen, the parallels Harington points to show that Ariosto not only followed his mentor's form, he also, more or less, imitated the Roman's matter. The variations between the two epics obviously involve a shifting of imagery, however. Furthermore, in showing that Ariosto paid heed to Aristotle and other critics in writing his epic, Harington gives further evidence concerning the practice of imitation: "Aristotle and the best censurers of Poesie would have the Epopeia, that is the heroicall Poem, should ground on some historie, and take some short time in the same to bewtifie with his Poetrie."¹¹¹ Under these conditions for writing the epic it would be impossible for the poet not to be imitative in the broadest sense of that word, since he would be following some historical source.

In Englishing Ariosto's poem, Harington suggests that he is engaged in composition rather than in what is now usually called translation:

Though for the matter I can challenge no praise, having but borrowed it; & for the verse I do challenge none, being a thing that every body that never scarce bayted their horse at the Universitie take upon them to make. It is possible that, if I would have employed that time that I have done upon this upon some invention of mine owne, I could have by this made it have risen to a just volume, &, if I wold, have done, as many spare not to do, flowne very high with stolen fethers. But I had rather men should see and know that I borrow all then that I steale any: and I would wish to be called rather one of the worst translators then one of the meaner makers, specially sith the Earle of Surrey and

Sir Thomas Wiat, that are yet called the first refiners of the English tong, were both translators out of Italian.¹¹²

There is, of course, every reason to suspect that Harington is being overly modest about his translation. Certainly, by placing himself in the same category as Wyatt and Surrey he indicates that translators are deserving of the title of poet. While he takes pains to call his work a translation, his comments on those who have "flowne very high with stolen fethers" indicate that, in his mind at least, there was no distinction between translation and some kinds of composition other than acknowledging the source from which the later work derived.

Yet another literary controversy supplies evidence for the age's awareness of imitation. In an attack on Robert Greene, Gabriel Harvey argues for a more moderate tone in such attacks. He is quite possibly being satirical, since he called Greene a "Monarch of Crossbiters and very Emperor of Shifters" in a series of letters which one critic characterizes as "chiefly remarkable for their virulent abuse."¹¹³ Harvey refers to the uses and abuses of imitation:

Salust and Clodius learned of Tully to frame artificiall Declamations and patheticall Invectives against Tully himselfe, and other worthy members of that most flourishing State: if mother Hubbard, in the vaine of Chawcer, happen to tel one Canicular tale, father Elderton and his sonne Greene, in the vaine of Skelton or Scoggin, will counterfeit an hundred dogged Fables, Libles, Calumnies, Slaunders, Lies for the whetstone, what not, & most currishly sparle & bite where they should most kindly fawne and licke.¹¹⁴

Just as lesser men than Cicero had learned by imitating him how to abuse their betters, so have lesser men than Spenser learned by imitating him how to abuse their betters. The point Harvey is making

is that those who might be imitated should be careful what they write lest their imitators, through malevolence or ignorance, misuse them.

Harvey also offers evidence of the imitation of form when he modestly admits having invented the English hexameter, in imitation, of course, of the classics. The Greeks and Latins reserved the hexameter for poems describing brave and heroic acts; so too should the English:

And I wis the English is nothing too good to imitat the Greeke, or Latine, or other eloquent Languages that honour the Hexameter as the soveraigne of verses and the high Controwler of Rimes. If I never deserve anye better remembrance, let mee rather be epitaphed, The Inventour of the English Hexameter--whome learned M. Stanihurst imitated in his Virgill, and excellent Sir Phillip Sidney disdained not to follow in his Arcadia & elsewhere.¹¹⁵

Harvey's attack on Greene shows that at least a portion of the contemporary audience encouraged writers to imitate one another. Harvey disclaims any extensive knowledge of Greene's works, saying that he has simply scanned some of them in the stationers' shops, but what he has seen has alarmed him.

But I pray God they have not done more harme by corruption of manners then good by quickening of witte: and I would some Buyers had either more Reason to discerne, or lesse Appetite to desire such Novels. The world is full inough of fooleries, though the humor be not feasted with such luxurious and riotous Pamphlets. Howe unlike Tullies sweete Offices; or Isocrates pithy instructions; or Plutarches holesome Morralls; or the delicate Dialogues of Xenophon and Plato; or the sage Tragedies of Sophocles and Euripides; or the fine Comedies of the dainetiest Atticke wittes; or other excellent monumentes of antiquity, never sufficientlie perused! Yet the one as stale as oldest fashions; and what more freshly current for awhile then the other? Even Guicciardines silver Historie and Ariostos golden Cantoes grow out of request, & the Countesse of Pembrookes Arcadia is not greene inough for queasie stomackes; but they must have Greenes Arcadia, and, I beleeve, most eagerlie longed for Greenes Faerie Queene.¹¹⁶

Basically, Harvey is arguing that the pamphlets he is complaining

about imitate the wrong authors, for they ignore the classical writers for those moderns who have become fashionable. But even the more modern writers are not immune to the vagaries of popular taste. Harvey's scorn for the practices of the pamphleteers is even more graphically described when he says:

Better the dogges-meate of Agrippa or Cattes-meate of Poggius then the swines-meate of Martial or goates-meate of Arretine. Cannot an Italian ribald vomit out the infectious poyson of the world but an Englishe' horrel-lorrel must lick it up for a restorative, and attempt to putrify gentle mindes with the vilest impostumes of lewde corruption?¹¹⁷

It should be understood that Harvey, preferring genius to art, censured all work that was merely imitative, but the discriminations he makes above show that he feels even evils afford choice.

The allusion to the pamphleteers apparently stung, for Thomas Nash chose to answer Harvey. Nash asserts that he is not an imitator of other English poets:

Wherein I have borrowed from Greene or Tarlton, that I should thanke them for all I have? Is my stile like Greenes, or my jeasts like Tarltons? Do I talke of any counterfeit birds, or hearbs, or stones, or rake up any new-found poetry from under the wals of Troy? . . .

This I will proudly boast . . . that the vaine which I have . . . is of my owne begetting, and cals no man father in England but my selfe, neyther Euphues, nor Tarlton, nor Greene. Not Tarlton nor Greene but have beene contented to let my simple judgement overrule them in some matters of wit.¹¹⁸

Nash is quite adamant about his originality, and had he written no further, one might be justified in inferring that he was not consciously aware of imitating any other Englishman, although the tenor of his protest suggests that Harvey had indeed touched a sore spot. But after he exonerates himself from the charge of imitating his contemporaries, Nash admits, obliquely, to imitation of the ancients:

Euphues I readd when I was a little ape in Cambridge, and then I thought it was Ipse ille; it may be excellent good still for ought I know, for I lookt not on it this ten yeare: but to imitate it I abhorre, otherwise than it imitates Plutarch, Ovid, and the choisest Latine Authors.¹¹⁹

Nash here gives tacit approval to imitation of the ancients, as did almost every other writer of the period.

This is not the place to adjudicate the quarrel between Nash and Harvey; rather I am concerned with demonstrating that English writers imitated and learned from one another by imitation. For this purpose, the invective of Nash and Harvey, whether justified or no, is highly instructive of the literary practices of the time. To Harvey, Nash was nothing more than a copier: "His gayest floorishes are but Gascoignes weedes, or Tarletons trickes, or Greenes cranks, or Marlowes bravadoes; his jestes but the dregges of common scurrilitie, or the shreds of the theater, or the of-scouring of new Pamflets."¹²⁰ Nash denied all the charges made by Harvey, yet in his denial he admitted to the necessity of imitating the ancients. While Harvey's words may not accurately characterize Nash's work, they very probably are an accurate generalization about the writings of other Renaissance pamphleteers who must have constantly been on the qui vive for material, as they would say, to imitate or, as Harvey would say, to copy.

Richard Carew, more sober in tone, speaks of imitation in his "The Excellency of the English Tongue," an encomium of the language. Among other excellencies of English, Carew notes that the extensive vocabulary of English makes it particularly suitable for adapting verse forms from some other literature: "Looke into our Imitacione

of all sortes of verses affoorded by any other Language, and you shall finde that Sr. Phillip Sidney, Mr. Stanihurst, and divers moe, have made use how farre wee are within compasse of a fore imagined impossibility in that behalff."¹²¹ A similar argument is advanced in support of the proposition that the extensive word borrowing of English results in its ability to reproduce the exact tone and mood of another literature:

Adde hereunto, that what soever grace any other Language carryeth, in Verse or Prose, in Tropes or Metaphors, in Ecchoes or Agnominations, they maye all be lively and exactly represented in ours. Will you have Platos wayne? reede Sir Thomas Smith: The Ionick? Sir Tho. Moor: Ciceros? Aschame: Varro? Chaucer: Demosthenes? Sir John Cheeke. . . . Will yow reade Virgill? take the Earll of Surrey: Catullus? Shakespheare, and Marlowes fragment: Ovid? Daniell: Lucane? Spencer: Martiall? Sir John Davis and others. Will yow have all in all for prose and verse? take the miracle of our age Sir Philip Sydney.¹²²

Carew's observations again make the point that imitation was a quite respectable universal practice during the Renaissance.

George Chapman's preface to Seaven Bookes of the Iliades of Homere contains a statement which supports Harington's view that the translator's job is something more than that of rendering faithfully a literal transcription of a foreign work into English: "The worth of a skilfull and worthy translator is to observe the sentences, figures, and formes of speech proposed in his author, his true sence and height, and to adorne them with figures and formes of oration fitted to the originall in the same tongue to which they are translated."¹²³ It is interesting that in addition to showing the measure of artistic freedom allowed to the translator, a freedom which suggests that the translation approached imitation, Chapman's words

also demonstrate the translator's dependence on rhetoric, the source of adornment. Such dependence argues a thoroughgoing knowledge of the subject.

Francis Meres' "Palladis Tamia," best known for its references to Shakespeare, reiterates commonplace attitudes toward imitation. Among the many passages which might be cited from that section called "A Comparative Discourse of Our English Poets with the Greeke, Latine, and Italian Poets" is one praising Sidney:

As Xenophon, who did imitate so excellently as to give us effigiem justi imperii, "the portraiture of a just empyre," under the name of Cyrus (as Cicero saith of him), made therein an absolute heroicall poem; and as Heliodorus writ in prose his sugred invention of that picture of Love in Theagines and Cariclea; and yet both excellent admired poets: so Sir Philip Sidney writ his immortal poem, The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia in Prose; and yet our rarest Poet.¹²⁴

The context of this passage, once more, clearly indicates the Renaissance ambiguity about the meaning of "imitate." Here the word apparently means to copy from nature rather than from some work of literature. A few lines later, however, Meres praises Spenser: "As Theocritus is famous for his Idyllia in Greeke, and Virgill for his Eclogs in Latine: so Spencer their imitator in his Shepheardes Calender is renowned for the like argument."¹²⁵ In this context "imitate" means to use the same idea that an earlier writer used. "Imitate" is used with yet another meaning when Meres praises Drayton: "As Virgil doth imitate Catullus in the like matter of Ariadne for his story of Queene Dido: so Michael Drayton doth imitate Ovid in his England's Heroical Epistles."¹²⁶ In this instance "imitate" means to borrow matter. While it is imitation in the latter two senses of the word which is of primary interest to this

essay, it should be recognized that, no matter the context, imitation is usually grounds for praise, rarely for censure.

Even when there appears to be objection to imitation, closer inspection usually reveals that such is not the case. For example, in replying to Campion's treatise against rhyme, Samuel Daniel argues that to follow Campion's suggestions would be comparable to a prisoner changing prisons, and with just as little advantage:

"As good still to use ryme and a little reason as neither ryme nor reason, for no doubt, as idle wits will write in that kinde, as do now in this, imitation wil after, though it breake her necke."¹²⁷

The point being made by Daniel, however, is that indiscriminate poets will indiscriminately emulate whatever is fashionable, and, if there is any criticism implied by this remark, it is directed at such unoriginal men, who cannot master a good method.

Campion also had urged English poets to follow the classics in eschewing rhyme; Daniel replies that past admiration and imitation of classical literature was based on its content, not its form: "We admire them not for their smooth-gliding words, nor their measures, but for their inventions."¹²⁸ By invention Daniel apparently means content or matter; he further explicates his remark:

For seeing it is matter that satisfies the judicall, appeare it in what habite it will, all these pretended proportions of words, howsoever placed, can be but words, and peradventure serve but to embroyle our understanding; whilst seeking to please our eare, we enthrall our judgement; to delight an exterior sense, wee smoothe up a weake confused sense, affecting sound to be unsound, and all to seeme Servum pecus, onely to imitate Greekes and Latines, whose felicitie in this kinde might be something to themselves, to whome their owne idioma was naturall; but to us it can yeeld no other commoditie then a sound.¹²⁹

Daniel's argument here is simply that the quantitative verse of

classical literature is unsuitable to English and any attempt to imitate the Greeks and Romans in this regard is liable to obscure meaning. The words themselves, and the images they create, are what is important in an imitation.

That the ancients are to be followed in some respects is implied by his charge that Campion inconsistently alters their rules at the same time he is urging Englishmen to emulate them by abjuring rhyme: "First, we must heere imitate the Greekes and Latines, and yet we are heere shewed to disobey them, even in their owne numbers and quantities."¹³⁰

It is conjectured that Daniel's "A Defence of Ryme" was written in 1603, the year of Elizabeth's death, and, therefore, a convenient time for ending this survey. Shakespeare was about thirty-nine years old and in the middle of a successful career, already the author of approximately fifteen plays. The survey leaves no possibility that he, literate and English, could have been ignorant of the imitative approach toward composition. He could only have escaped it had he been educated without being schooled and informed without having read or discussed.

IV

The charges of unoriginality directed by one English writer at another--Harvey's attack on Nash, for example--are almost without exception provoked by personal rather than theoretical considerations. A writer may be criticized because he is unoriginal, but not simply because he imitated another. And should a writer such as Nash deny having imitated his contemporaries, he at the same time admits

imitating the ancients. Obligated to be original, the writer knew originality could be achieved through imitation; failure to attain originality was seen as the fault of the individual, not the method of imitative composition.

Since the classical theory of imitation provided the basis for the English theory, a glance in that direction might be instructive. Representative of the classical attitude toward imitation is Quintilian, who devotes an entire chapter of his Institutes to the subject. It begins:

It is from these and other authors worthy of our study that we must draw our stock of words, the variety of our figures and our methods of composition, while we must form our minds on the model of every excellence. For there can be no doubt that in art no small portion of our task lies in imitation, since, although invention came first and is all-important, it is expedient to imitate whatever has been invented with success. And it is a universal rule of life that we should wish to copy what we approve in others. It is for this reason that boys copy the shapes of letters that they may learn to write, and that musicians take the voices of their teachers, painters the works of their predecessors, and peasants the principles of agriculture which have been proved in practice, as models for their imitation. In fact, we may note that the elementary study of every branch of learning is directed by reference to some definite standard that is placed before the learner. We must, in fact, either be like or unlike those who have proved their excellence. It is rare for nature to produce such resemblance, which is more often the result of imitation.¹³¹

While not the ultimate classical authority, Quintilian, writing in the first century A.D., is basing his advice on a tradition extending at least five centuries further back in the past. Quintilian's statement implies the possibility of approaches to excellence other than imitation, but imitation provides the quickest route to that destination, as well as a means for the traveler to know whether he has arrived. Prior to the discussion of imitation,

Quintilian reviews the authors he claims are worthy of study, all of whom were themselves imitators and many of whom were imitated by those who followed them. He studies these authors so that the student might have some guide to the proper models for imitation. Quintilian's ideal orator must fulfill three requirements: "the power of speech is the first essential . . . the power of imitation comes next, and third and last diligent practice in writing."¹³² The position of imitation in this triad is indicative of its importance, at least to Quintilian.

Longinus, approximately two centuries later, offers further evidence of the general acceptance of imitation as a method of composition when he remembers that Plato discovered a "path leading to the sublime."

What is this path, and how do we describe it? It is the imitation and emulation of the great writers of prose and poetry of old. And . . . let us hold fast to this endeavor. For many are inspired by a spirit not their own, as the Pythian priestess, it is said, approaches a tripod, where there is a crevasse in the earth, and breathes from thence a holy vapor, whence she becomes big with superhuman power and straightway prophesies through afflatus from on high: thus from the surpassing genius of the ancients, as from sacred outlets (one might say), channels run to the souls of those who emulate them, whereby even those not greatly susceptible to divine frenzy become inspired, and participate in the grandeur of others. Was Herodotus the only one to be "most Homeric"? Nay, Stesichorus was so before him and Archilochus, and most of all these Plato, who has diverted to himself countless rivulets fed from the great Homeric stream. Perhaps we should have needed to demonstrate this, if Ammonius had not collected the details and put them in writing. This is not plagiarism, but like taking the impression of a fair form in sculpture or some other kind of art.¹³³

It should be noted that Longinus in this passage recommends the method of imitation, not only as a means of composition, but also as a possible source of inspiration as well. The Ammonius he cites as his

authority for Plato's practice was an Alexandrian scholar who had written a book entitled On Plato's Borrowings from Homer.¹³⁴

While many other citations demonstrating the acceptance of imitation by both Greeks and Romans could be drawn from classical literature, the two quoted, particularly the latter, are representative. As H. O. White says, imitation was essential to classical literary theory, so much so that many considered independent fabrication a dangerous practice.¹³⁵

But, as White also notes, none of the classical authors thought imitation alone sufficient. The imitator was expected to display originality. Indeed, early in his chapter on imitation, Quintilian says:

The first point, then, that we must realise is that imitation alone is not sufficient, if only for the reason that a sluggish nature is only too ready to rest content with the inventions of others. For what would have happened in the days when models were not, if men had decided to do and think of nothing that they did not know already?¹³⁶

Quintilian was hardly the first to call for originality. About four hundred years before Quintilian, Isocrates in recommending imitation, although suggesting that it was impossible to be unoriginal, reminded his listeners of the necessity for originality:

If it were possible to present the same subject matter in one form and in no other, one might have reason to think it gratuitous to weary one's hearers by speaking again in the same manner as his predecessors; but . . . one must not shun the subjects upon which others have spoken before, but must try to speak better than they. For the deeds of the past are, indeed, an inheritance common to us all.¹³⁷

While there were those who undoubtedly recognized that originality could be achieved by writing on some subject or in some way never before attempted, all understood that originality was attainable through imitation, which was a perhaps better way of being

original. Certainly, Horace seemed to have thought so. Although he says,

if you write of things abstruse or new,
Some of your own inventing may be us'd,
So it be seldom and discreetly done,

and repeats essentially the same advice a few lines later, he also instructs in the preferable course of action by warning,

If your bold muse dare tread unbeaten paths,
And bring new characters upon the stage,
Be sure you keep them up to their first height.
New subjects are not easily explain'd,
And you had better choose a well-known theme,
Than trust to an invention of your own.¹³⁸

Thus, the classical author was expected to imitate, but he was also expected to be original when imitating.

H. O. White distinguishes three kinds of originality sought after by classical writers and speakers. There is, first, the kind of originality which could be exercised in the selection of that which was to be imitated.¹³⁹ However, the classical authors reach no final agreement on what is worthy of imitation. Opinion ranges from Horace's dictum "you must not copy trivial things,"¹⁴⁰ to Quintilian's catholic inclusion of all writers as potential sources:

I believe that there are few, indeed scarcely a single one of those authors who have stood the test of time who will not be of some use or other to judicious students, since even Cicero himself admits that he owes a great debt even to the earliest writers, who for all their talent were totally devoid of art. And my opinion about the moderns is much the same. For how few of them are so utterly crazy as not to have the least shadow of hope that some portion or other of their work may have claims upon the memory of posterity?¹⁴¹

Although there may have been no substantial agreement on what was to be imitated, there was general agreement that the imitator was

to exercise some standards of choice, thereby showing himself to be original.

A second kind of originality is called reinterpretation by White. To reinterpret is "to reexpress an old idea in the spirit of one's day, to give it the impress of one's individuality, to supplement it with the results of one's experience and observation."¹⁴² Isocrates includes reinterpretation as one of the objectives of oratory: "Oratory is of such a nature that it is possible to discourse on the same subject matter in many different ways . . . to recount the things of old in a new manner or set forth events of recent date in an old fashion."¹⁴³ In addition to the kind of reinterpretation suggested by Isocrates, the recasting of the old in a modern form or the casting of the new in an ancient one, a more complex kind of reinterpretation, by White called transformation, is implied by Quintilian's commentary on the treatment the orator should accord arguments he imitates:

Must not the orator breathe life into the argument and develop it? Must he not vary and diversify it by a thousand figures, and do all this in such a way that it seems to come into being as the very child of nature, not to reveal an artificial manufacture and a suspect art, nor at every moment to show traces of an instructor's hand?¹⁴⁴

That is, the imitator is obligated to add to whatever is imitated, either to its matter or to its style, and the artistry involved in the addition should be sufficient to conceal itself. Reinterpretation, then, either the more simple type suggested by Isocrates or the transformation of Quintilian, is another of the ways in which the classical imitator could be original.

Seneca expresses the same ideas about transformation with metaphors now commonplace. He writes of the complementary values

to be gained from alternately reading and writing; this course of action will result in the writer's profiting from his reading through imitation. "We should follow," he says, ". . . the example of the bees, who flit about and cull the flowers that are suitable for producing honey, and then arrange and assort in their cells all that they have brought in."¹⁴⁵ Having gathered the pollen, that which he intends to imitate, the writer "by applying the supervising care with which our nature has endowed us,--in other words, our natural gifts,-- . . . should so blend those several flavours into one delicious compound that, even though it betrays its origin, yet it nevertheless is clearly a different thing from that whence it came."¹⁴⁶ A few sentences later Seneca introduces a second metaphor, digestion, to describe the process of transformation. As is the case with the food we eat, "so it is with the food which nourishes our higher nature,--we should see to it that whatever we have absorbed should not be allowed to remain unchanged, or it will be no part of us."¹⁴⁷ Finally, Seneca adds a third metaphor to explain that the writer is obligated to transform that which he is imitating: "Even if there shall appear in you a likeness to him who, by reason of your admiration, has left a deep impress upon you, I would have you resemble him as a child resembles his father, and not as a picture resembles its original; for a picture is a lifeless thing."¹⁴⁸ Reinterpretation, then, either the more simple type suggested by Isocrates or the transformation recommended by Quintilian and Seneca, is another of the ways in which the classical imitator could be original.

The third and final kind of originality White discerns involves the requirement that an imitation be an improvement upon the original, and about this ideal there is no lack of comment. Almost all who mention the subject of imitation add that the work of the orator or writer should be in some way better than that which it imitates. Such is the case with Longinus, who adds a reason why the imitator must attempt to improve on his model: "I think Plato would never have come to such fulness of powers in the doctrines of philosophy nor have ventured, as so often he does, into the subjects and expressions of poetry, if he had not with all his force contended for the chief prize with Homer."¹⁴⁹ The author of On the Sublime makes it clear that the attempt to improve is what is important, even in those cases where there is little likelihood of success, for "this contest and the crown it brings is a noble one, and well worth the winning, wherein even defeat at the hands of older men is no disgrace."¹⁵⁰ Similar thoughts are expressed by Quintilian. One should not despair of surpassing his models, he says, for "there is not one [model] who has not some deficiency or blemish."¹⁵¹ Even he who aims at something less than excellence needs to attempt to improve upon that which he is imitating: "For the man whose aim is to prove himself better than another, even if he does not surpass him, may hope to equal him. But he can never hope to equal him, if he thinks it his duty merely to tread in his footsteps: for the mere follower must always lag behind."¹⁵² Hence, any attempt to be exactly imitative, to equal rather than excel, is doomed to failure because "whatever is like another object, must necessarily be inferior to the object of its imitation, just as

the shadow is inferior to the substance, the portrait to the features which it portrays, and the acting of the player to the feelings which he endeavours to reproduce."¹⁵³ Horace, in recommending that the poet select some subject about which many others have written, also affirms the ideal that the writer improve upon his model:

And you had better choose a well-known theme,
 Than trust to an invention of your own,
 For what originally others write,
 May be so well disguised, and so improv'd 154
 That with some justice it may pass for yours.

Horace's advice and the tone with which it is tendered allow the inference that the process of disguising and improving the theme selected for imitation was the practice approved by theory.

Clearly, classical literary theory encouraged imitation, but required the imitator to strive for originality by selecting carefully what was to be imitated, or by reinterpreting that which was imitated, or by improving upon that which was imitated, or by any combination of these. Nor can there be any doubt that the English followed their classical masters in attempting to conform to the conditions for originality.

The last time we looked at Sir John Harington we were concerned with his contribution to the controversy about the meaning and uses of imitation. He also, however, well illustrates the principles of selection and reinterpretation. In his defense of his so-called translation of Orlando Furioso, a work perhaps best described as an imitation rather than a translation in the modern sense, he shows his awareness of each of these criteria of originality.

Replying to the criticism that he "should spend so much good time on such a trifling worke as they deemed a Poeme to be," Harington reasons that if he has selected unwisely "either it is already excused or it will never be excused; for I have I thinke sufficiently proved both the art to be allowable and this worke to be commendable."¹⁵⁵ Certain passages in the poem have caused him to imagine what his tutor might have said to him upon discovering he had translated Ariosto, "'Was it for this that I read Aristotle and Plato to you, and instructed you so carefully both in Greek & Latin, to have you now become a translator of Italian toyes?"¹⁵⁶ Harington's reply to the hypothetical question he poses himself is that, if the poem were truly unworthy of serious consideration, it would not have put such a serious thought in his mind. Whether intentionally or not, Harington demonstrates his awareness of the method of selection.

Insofar as reinterpretation is concerned, Harington achieves originality by omission and by addition. He confesses to omitting parts of various cantos of Ariosto's work, as well as combining in some instances several of the verses of the original into one in his translation, possibly in an attempt to make the poem a more unified structure.¹⁵⁷ Because some things in the Italian poem would be relatively meaningless to the English reader, Harington omits them. About all such excisions he says, "For my omitting and abbreviating some things, either in matters impertinent to us, or in some to tediousse flatteries of persons that we never heard of, if I have done ill I crave pardon: for sure I did it for the best."¹⁵⁸ So that the poem would be sure to have something of his

own in it, Harington "added some notes to the end of every canto, even as if some of my friends and my selfe reading it together . . . had after debated upon them what had bene most worthie consideration."¹⁵⁹ In these notes he mentions the names of his "owne frends & kin," an addition for which he was apparently criticized rather harshly by some of his contemporaries. Thus, while his reinterpretation is not extensive, Harington takes care to show that his work is original in that particular.

Finally, although he never directly suggests that his work is an improvement on the original, he implies that this is the case by the changes he makes, all the while being careful to point out that his Orlando cannot be considered a literal translation. By inviting comparison of his translation with the original, Harington suggests that his work, because of the changes he has made, is the better, even though he does no violence to the original, as will be immediately apparent to the discriminating and knowledgeable reader: "But if anie being studious of the Italian would for his understanding compare them, the first sixe bookes, save a litle of the third, will stand him in steed."¹⁶⁰ Nevertheless, the English Orlando should not be considered a literal translation: "I would not have any man except that I should observe his phrase so strictly as an interpreter, nor the matter so carefully as if it had bene a storie, in which to varie were as great a sinne as it were simplicities in this to go word for word."¹⁶¹ Although Harington speaks of himself as being only a translator, it is obvious that he saw himself as a poet: "I would wish," he says, "to be called rather one of the worst translators then one of the meaner makers,

specially with the Earle of Surrey and Sir Thomas Wyatt, that are yet called the first refiners of the English tongue, were both translators out of Italian."¹⁶² Furthermore, he saw himself working in the tradition of imitative composition, as his statement acknowledging his debt shows: "For the matter I can challenge no praise, having but borrowed it."¹⁶³ His subsequent remarks are evidence that he, and doubtless most other English writers of the period, were aware of and conformed to the classical prescription requiring an imitation to be original.

V

On the assumption, then, that Shakespeare understood and practiced the imitative approach to composition, an approach that insisted that the imitator be somehow original, this study will in the following chapters demonstrate that, however else Shakespeare achieved originality, a comparison of certain of his plays with their sources reveals that one way was through a substantially different imagery.

Many scholars have established that Shakespeare was a borrower. Allardyce Nicoll claims that present-day critics agree on the futility of further scholarship in the area of Shakespeare's sources unless such studies apply themselves to "the essential task --the imaginative consideration of Shakespeare's creative genius in the light of these sources."¹⁶⁴ The present study undertakes that task.

In the past, parallels between the language of a play and its source, noted by Shakespearean scholars, are more often than

not cited as examples of how closely Shakespeare followed his sources. Muir, for example, shows how a nonsensical line in Coriolanus can be clarified by an examination of the corresponding passage in the source of the play. Citing the lines from Act II, Scene 3,

And Nobly nam'd, so twice being Censor,
Was his great Ancestor,

Muir invites us to compare them with these similar lines from North's translation of Plutarch,

And Censorinus that was so surnamed,
And Nobly nam'd so, twice being Censor.¹⁶⁵

Another of Muir's examples demonstrates how the playwright's source was responsible for an anachronism, and a third indicates that a number of sources were used for one particular passage.¹⁶⁶ This kind of observation is valuable in that it always broadens our knowledge about, and often increases our understanding of, a play. Whereas the foregoing approach leads from a comparison of either to establish the fact of source or at most to explicate difficulties within the play, the present approach examines the distinctive imageries of source and play in an attempt to describe how the two differ in meaning.

It has been the judgment of history that the works used as sources by Shakespeare for Romeo and Juliet, As You Like It, and Twelfth Night are something less than first-rate. Certainly, the modern reader, diverted by the opportunity of reading the master-works of other periods, usually neglects the considerable body of second- and third-line literature which was produced in sixteenth-century England. He is willing, since it is usually necessary, to accept the evaluation made by those critics whose especial business

it is to read all of the literature of the Renaissance. Thus, these works are usually forgotten, and forgotten also is the fact that in the eyes of their creators and their contemporary audience they were works of art. There may have been a division of opinion at the time as to the merits of a particular work, but there was no difference of opinion about the propriety of exercising critical judgment over what was offered as art.

Therefore, one reason why the sources of Romeo and Juliet, As You Like It, and Twelfth Night are particularly well suited for this study is that each, itself a complete and separate work, was somewhat popular with Shakespeare's audience, many of whom doubtless had read it and immediately recognized the relationship of the source to the play and, because of the imitative approach to composition, understood the playwright's obligation to achieve originality. While that can only be seen dimly in Shakespeare today, it was clearly seen then. The modern reader can only begin to appreciate subtleties which would have been obvious to a well-read, well-educated, sixteenth-century Londoner. To him, the knowledge of the source of the play and an understanding of the imitative approach to composition would have suggested that the relation between the two involved something more than a mere retelling of the same story. If the modern reader neglects the sound sixteenth-century assumptions, he will never reach a true understanding of the relationships that contributed heavily to the intellectual joys of playgoing in the great age.

An immediately practical reason for choosing Romeo and Juliet, As You Like It, Twelfth Night, and their sources is that the consensus

of scholarly opinion has established that each play emanates almost wholly from the single work identified as its source. Thus, each pair offers an excellent opportunity to examine the imitative approach to composition.

In the succeeding chapters of this study the aforementioned plays and their sources are analyzed for their imageries. This comparison of imagery reveals an important component of the nature and extent of Shakespeare's originality, his reinterpretation and improvement upon his source. The investigation shows that in every case the play follows the story line of the source very closely; however, in each pair the imagery of the source and the imagery of the play differ significantly. As we study Romeo and Juliet and Twelfth Night, we shall find in each instance that both play and source have organized imagery, but that the conclusions suggested by the imagery of the source are not those suggested by the imagery of the play, even though there are similarities between the language of the source and the language of the play. As for As You Like It, on the other hand, though the plots of play and source are very similar, the source lacks any discernable organization of imagery that allows interpretation. In the play, however, there is a highly organized imagery which does allow interpretation. Thus, through this process another kind of originality dependent upon interpretation evolves which can be seen, on the one hand, to amount to a change of meaning between source and play, and, on the other, the achievement of meaning where none was before.

.

NOTES

1. Sir Philip Sidney, "An Apologie for Poetrie," Elizabethan Critical Essays, ed. G. Gregory Smith (London: Oxford University Press, 1904), I, 158.
2. Ibid., 159.
3. Ibid., 195.
4. Harold Ogden White, Plagiarism and Imitation During the English Renaissance (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935), p. 61n.
5. Charles Sears Baldwin, Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice, ed. Donald Lemen Clark (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939), pp. 39-154.
6. Ibid., p. 52.
7. Ibid., p. 53.
8. John Brinsley, Ludus Literarius (1612), p. 177, quoted in Donald Lemen Clark, John Milton at St. Paul's School (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948), p. 169.
9. Donald Lemen Clark, John Milton at St. Paul's School (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948), p. 168.
10. Roger Ascham, English Works, ed William Aldis Wright (Cambridge: The University Press, 1904), p. 239, also cited by Clark, pp. 168-169.
11. Clark, p. 3.
12. T. W. Baldwin, William Shakspeare's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1944), I, 120.
13. Ascham, p. 163, also cited by Clark, p. 173.
14. Clark, p. 172.
15. John Brinsley, A Consolation for Our Grammar Schooles (New York: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1943), pp. 31-32.
16. Ibid., pp. 32-41F.

17. Ibid., p. 35F2.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid., p. 44.
20. Ibid.
21. T. W. Baldwin, I, 584.
22. Charles Hoole, A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching School, ed. Thiselton Mark (Syracuse: C. W. Bardeen, 1912), p. 107.
23. Ibid., p. 103.
24. Ibid., p. 114.
25. Ibid., p. 115.
26. Ibid., pp. 117-118.
27. Ibid., p. 118.
28. Ibid., p. 136.
29. T. W. Baldwin, I, 607-640.
30. Ibid.
31. Hoole, p. 123.
32. Ibid., p. 126.
33. Ibid., p. 127.
34. Ibid., pp. 127-128.
35. Ibid., p. 128.
36. Ibid., p. 149.
37. Ibid., p. 179.
38. Ibid., p. 180.
39. Interestingly, considering the date of Hoole's book, the pedagogue recommends the acting out of acts and scenes from Terence as an aid in preparing the student for the delivery of orations (Hoole, pp. 180-181).
40. Hoole, p. 183.
41. Ibid., p. 182.

42. Ibid., pp. 182-183.
43. Ibid., p. 185.
44. Ibid., p. 186.
45. Ibid., p. 188.
46. Ibid., p. 190.
47. Ibid., pp. 190-191.
48. Ibid., p. 192.
49. Ibid.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid., p. 193.
52. Ibid., p. 194.
53. Ibid., p. 207.
54. Ibid., pp. 219-220.
55. Ibid., p. 202.
56. Ibid., pp. 202-203.
57. Ibid., p. 209.
58. Ibid., p. 210.
59. Ibid., pp. 210-211.
60. Ibid., p. 211.
61. Ibid., p. 212.
62. Ibid. Interestingly, Hoole adds a commentary that reveals the basic division between those who ascribed poetic success to nature and those who maintained poetry to derive from art:

From this little that hath been said, they that have a natural aptness and delight in Poetry, may proceed to more exquisite perfection in that Art, then any rules of teaching can reach unto; and there are very few so meanly witted, but by diligent use of the directions now given, may attain to so much skill, as to be able to judge of any verse, and upon a fit occasion or subject, to compose a handsome copy; though not so fluently or neatly as they that have a natural sharpnesse and dexterity in the Art of Poetry.

63. Ibid., p. 221.
64. T. W. Baldwin, II, 662.
65. Ibid.
66. Hoole, p. 108n.
67. T. W. Baldwin, I, 458.
68. William Shakespeare, Love's Labor's Lost, in The Complete Works of Shakespeare, ed. George Lyman Kittredge (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1936), I.i.86-87, also cited by White, p. 107.
69. Ibid., V.ii.315-316, also cited by White, p. 107.
70. Ibid., IV.ii.67-73.
71. Hoole, p. 212.
72. Ibid., p. 221.
73. Shakespeare, IV.ii.95-100.
74. See p. 24.
75. Shakespeare, IV.ii.123-132, also cited by White, p. 107.
76. T. W. Baldwin records many, many further examples which support this contention, particularly in Vol. II, chaps. xxxviii-xli.
77. King James VI, "Ane Schort Treatise conteining some Reulis and Cautelis to be observit and eschewit in Scottis Poesie," Elizabethan Critical Essays, I, 220, also cited by White, p. 65.
78. Ibid.
79. Ibid.
80. White, p. 65.
81. King James VI, p. 211.
82. Ibid., p. 221.
83. William Webbe, "A Discourse of English Poetrie," Elizabethan Critical Essays, I, 230.
84. Ibid., 231-232.
85. Ibid., 232.

86. Thomas Nash, "Preface to Greene's Menaphon," Elizabethan Critical Essays, I, 307-308.
87. Ibid., 311-312.
88. Ibid., 312. Some theorize the reference to Aesop to be an allusion to Kyd (Elizabethan Critical Essays, I, 424).
89. Ibid., 308-309.
90. Ibid., 309.
91. Ibid., 313.
92. Ibid., 334.
93. Ibid.
94. White, p. 95.
95. George Puttenham, "The Arte of English Poesie," Elizabethan Critical Essays, II, 27.
96. Ibid.
97. Ibid., 188.
98. Ibid., 3.
99. Ibid.
100. Ibid., 4.
101. Ibid., 4-5.
102. Ibid., 190-191.
103. Ibid., 64.
104. Ibid.
105. Ibid., 65-66.
106. Ibid., 62.
107. The editor of Elizabethan Critical Essays identifies this individual as John Southern (ibid., 421).
108. George Puttenham, p. 171.
109. Sir John Harington, "A Preface, or rather a Briefe Apologie of Poetrie," Elizabethan Critical Essays, II, 196.

110. Ibid., 211-212.
111. Ibid., 216.
112. Ibid., 218-219.
113. Gabriel Harvey, "Foure Letters," Elizabethan Critical Essays, II, 229.
114. Ibid., 229-230.
115. Ibid., 230-231.
116. Ibid., 231.
117. Gabriel Harvey, "Pierce's Supererogation," Elizabethan Critical Essays, II, 259.
118. Thomas Nash, "Strange Newes, or Foure Letters Confuted," Elizabethan Critical Essays, II, 243.
119. Ibid.
120. Gabriel Harvey, "Pierce's Supererogation," p. 266.
121. Richard Carew, "The Excellency of the English Tongue," Elizabethan Critical Essays, II, 292.
122. Ibid., 293.
123. George Chapman, "Preface to Seaven Bookes of the Iliades of Homere," Elizabethan Critical Essays, II, 296.
124. Francis Meres, "Palladis Tamia," Elizabethan Critical Essays, II, 315-316.
125. Ibid., 316.
126. Ibid.
127. Samuel Daniel, "A Defence of Ryme," Elizabethan Critical Essays, II, 363.
128. Ibid., 364.
129. Ibid.
130. Ibid., 375. Daniel also furnishes further evidence of the influence of education on the writer when he, perhaps unkindly, asks why Campion undertook his essay against rhyme. Was the essay written for the learned? "If for the Learned, it was to no purpose, for everie Grammarian in this land hath learned

his Prosodia, and alreadie knowes all this Arte of numbers" (*ibid.*, 379). Was the essay supposed to benefit the ignorant? If so, "it was vaine, for if they become Versifiers, wee are like to have leane Numbers instead of fat Ryme; and if Tully would have his Orator skilld in all the knowledges appertaining to God and man, what should they have who would be a degree above Orators" (*ibid.*, 379)? If neither for the learned nor the ignorant, the only purpose of Campion's essay must have been self aggrandizement; and Daniel laments that "it is ever the misfortune of Learning to be wounded by her owne hand" (*ibid.*, 374). It should be clear that the object of Daniel's attack is Campion, or, more properly, Campion's proposals. When Daniel touches upon imitation, he is concerned with its misuse rather than its practice. The generous sprinkling of classical allusions and Latin phrases he uses to substantiate his arguments attests to Daniel's learning, and, as he says, no learned man was ignorant of prosody, itself taught by imitation. To Daniel emulation is "the strongest pulse that beats in high mindes" (*ibid.*, 374).

131. Quintilian, The Institutio Oratoria, tr. H. E. Butler (London: William Heinemann, Ltd, 1936), IV, 75. I am indebted to Harold Ogden White for leading me to this and to the other classical sources quoted in the following pages.
132. Ibid., 5.
133. Longinus, On the Sublime, tr. Benedict Einarson (Chicago: Packard and Company, 1945), pp. 29-30.
134. Ibid., p. 30n.
135. White, p. 6.
136. Quintilian, IV, 77.
137. Isocrates, "Panegyricus," Isocrates, tr. George Norlin (London: William Heinemann, Ltd, 1928), I, 123-125.
138. Horace, "The Art of Poetry," tr. the Earl of Roscommon, The Complete Works of Horace, tr. by various hands (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd, 1923), pp. 134, 137.
139. White, pp. 8-13.
140. Horace, p. 137.
141. Quintilian, IV, 25.
142. White, p. 9.
143. Isocrates, pp. 123-125.

144. Quintilian, II, 367.
145. Seneca, Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales, tr. Richard M. Gummere (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), II, 277.
146. Ibid., 279.
147. Ibid., 281.
148. Ibid. Gummere in his edition of Seneca informs his readers that "a considerable part of this letter is found in the preface to the Saturnalia of Macrobius, without any acknowledgment of indebtedness" (ibid., 276n.). Aside from the irony afforded, this information further illustrates the prevalence of the practice of imitation during the classical period.
149. Longinus, p. 30.
150. Ibid.
151. Quintilian, IV, 79.
152. Ibid.
153. Ibid., 79, 81.
154. Horace, p. 137.
155. Sir John Harington, pp. 219-220.
156. Ibid., p. 220.
157. Ibid.
158. Ibid., p. 222.
159. Ibid., p. 221.
160. Ibid., p. 222.
161. Ibid.
162. Ibid., p. 219.
163. Ibid., p. 218.
164. Kenneth Muir, Shakespeare's Sources, Vol. I: Comedies and Tragedies (London: Methuen & Company, Ltd, 1961), p. vii.
165. Ibid., pp. 222-223.
166. Ibid.

CHAPTER TWO

The image dominating Romeus and Juliet is that of Fortune, whereas Romeo and Juliet is characterized by a complex of dominating images. By the same token, the dramatic statement made by Brooke's poem is one-dimensional and conventional, whereas the complex of dominating images in Romeo and Juliet reveals a story reinterpreted to present a similarly complex, and hence more believable, world. Brooke's poem portrays a world in which the poem's characters have no control over their destiny, but a world which affords a rational explanation for this seeming chaos in the figure of Fortune. Rejecting this commonplace convention of the time, Shakespeare's play presents a world capable of many rational explanations, but never finally yielding to any single one.

So that there will be no misunderstanding about what is meant by image in this and succeeding chapters, let us agree to accept Caroline Spurgeon's definition. She says:

I use the term "image" here as the only available word to cover every kind of simile, as well as every kind of what is really compressed simile--metaphor. I suggest that we divest our minds of the hint the term carries with it of visual image only, and think of it, for the present purpose, as connoting any and every imaginative picture or other experience, drawn in every kind of way, which may have come to the poet, not only through any of his senses, but through his mind and emotions as well, and which he uses, in the forms of simile and metaphor in their widest sense, for purposes of analogy.¹

This definition is comprehensive, extending the boundaries of the term

far beyond the limits sometimes set for it. But in a study of imitation such an all-encompassing definition has the advantage of assuring that a dominant feature of an author's language--such as the personification of Fortune in the case of Brooke--will not be overlooked.

The story Brooke tells is basically the story Shakespeare tells. In Verona, ruled by Prince Escalus, are two feuding families, the Montagues and the Capulets. Romeus, son of the head of the Montague family, attends uninvited a ball given by the head of the Capulet family. There, he and Juliet, daughter of his unwilling host, meet and fall in love. They have a clandestine courtship and are eventually married secretly by Friar Laurence. Subsequently, Romeus kills Juliet's kinsman, Tybalt, in a duel, for which act of violence the young husband is banished from Verona and Juliet. To avoid being forced into a marriage, Juliet, upon the advice of Friar Laurence, takes a sleeping potion which gives her the appearance of death. She is entombed, and Romeus, ignorant of the device, returns to Verona. Seeing Juliet in her tomb and believing her dead, he poisons himself. Juliet awakens, sees her husband dead, and kills herself with his dagger. Whoever has read Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet will recognize the essential similarities in plot between the play and the poem; there are many other similarities between the two, so many that it would be almost impossible to conclude Shakespeare did not knowingly imitate Brooke's poem. Furthermore, in both cases it is the imagery which gives this story life, but the different image structure of the two works is evidence that, whatever else Shakespeare might have borrowed, he did not find his imagery in Brooke.

The images of Brooke's poem are diverse, but one dominates: Fortune. There are an undeniably large number of references to that cosmic force and to other closely related ideas suggested by words and figures of speech such as "fate," "chance," "hap," "mishap," and "doom." The word "fortune" itself, capitalized or not, occurs approximately forty times in the course of the poem; and, while this statistic alone has little to recommend it as an indicator of the dominating imagery of the poem, it together with the other available evidence strongly suggest Fortune is the poem's dominating image.

Another clue pointing to the dominance of Fortune in Brooke's poem is his use of the concept of Fortune's wheel. The conventional view of Fortune saw it as a cyclical process; witness the presentation of the theme in Fall of Princes, Lydgate's imitation of Boccaccio, and the later Mirrour for Magistrates, the first volume of which was printed only a few years before Brooke's poem and thus may have influenced his treatment of his story. The worst position to occupy on Fortune's wheel, of course, is the top position, because the most fortunate individual can only fall from Fortune's favor, a fall made more poignant by his erstwhile good fortune.

Quite clearly, Brooke capitalized on this idea by his description of Verona and its ruler. Both occupy the highest position on Fortune's wheel at the beginning of the poem:

There is beyond the Alps, a town of ancient fame,
Whose bright renown yet shineth clear: Verona men it name;
Built in a happy time, built on a fertile soil,
Maintained by the heavenly fates, and by the townish toil.
The fruitful hills above, the pleasant vales below,
The silver stream with channel deep, that thro' the town doth
flow,

The store of springs that serve for use, and eke for ease,
 And other more commodities, which profit may and please,--
 Eke many certain signs of things betid of old,
 To fill the hungry eyes of those that curiously behold,
 Do make this town to be preferred above the rest
 Of Lombard towns, or at the least, comparéd with the best.
 In which while Escalus as prince alone did reign,
 To reach reward unto the good, to pay the lewd with pain,
 Alas, I rue to think, an heavy hap befell.²

Because Verona and Escalus cannot improve upon this happy state of affairs, it follows that they must in some way be less fortunate at the end of the poem.

Brooke establishes similar positions on Fortune's wheel for the feuding families:

There were two ancient stocks, which Fortune high did
 place
 Above the rest, indued with wealth, and nobler of their race,
 Loved of the common sort, loved of the prince alike,
 And like unhappy were they both, when Fortune list to strike.³

What is to happen involves not only the city and its prince, but the two leading families of Verona.

But it is Romeus and Juliet who are Fortune's special victims, and Brooke employs the metaphor of Fortune and her wheel to describe their happiness and forecast their doom. It is Fortune who is responsible for the lovers' happiness:

But Fortune such delight as theirs did never grant me yet.

 The blindfold goddess that with frowning face doth fray,
 And from their seat the mighty kings throws down with headlong
 sway,
 Beginneth now to turn to these her smiling face;
 Needs must they taste of great delight, so much in Fortune's
 grace.⁴

Romeus and Juliet continue to enjoy Fortune's favor for a month or two.

Happiness is impossible to sustain in the world of Romeus and Juliet because fickle Fortune is in control of man's fate. To establish this, Brooke interrupts his narrative and employs the metaphor of Fortune and her wheel in a lengthy discourse:

But who is he that can his present state assure?
 And say unto himself, thy joys shall yet a day endure?
 So wavering Fortune's wheel, her changes be so strange;
 And every wight y-thralléd is by Fate unto her change,
 Who reigns so over all, that each man hath his part
 (Although not aye, perchance, alike) of pleasure and of smart.
 For after many joys some feel but little pain,
 And from that little grief they turn to happy joy again.
 But other some there are, that, living long in woe,
 At length they be in quiet ease, but long abide not so;
 Whose grief is much increased by mirth that went before,
 Because the sudden change of things doth make it seem the
 more.
 Of this unlucky sort our Romeus is one,
 For all his hap turns to mishap, and all his mirth to moan.
 And joyful Juliet another leaf must turn;
 As wont she was, her joys bereft, she must begin to mourn.⁵

Should there be the reader who had not understood Romeus and Juliet were Fortune's victims, Brooke reiterates two lines later:

Whom glorious Fortune erst had heaved to the skies,
 By envious Fortune overthrown, on earth now grovelling lies.⁶

Nor is Brooke content to indicate Fortune's role in the poem solely by withdrawing to comment on the personification. Rather, Fortune takes an active part in the lives of Romeus and Juliet especially responsible for their tragedy. In a forecast of Romeus' fate before he meets Juliet the identification of Fortune as the villain is made: "False Fortune" it is who will create for Romeus a "mischief" which will make him wish that he had "been never born."⁷ Upon discovering the identity of the other's family, both Romeus and Juliet correctly blame Fortune for their plight. Juliet alludes to Fortune's role in her life as she laments: "What hap have I . . . to love my father's foe."⁸ And Romeus

with piteous plaint, fierce Fortune doth he blame,
That in his ruth and wretched plight doth seek her laughing
game.⁹

Ironically, neither realizes the ultimate fate Fortune has in store.

Having fallen in love, Romeus and Juliet secretly marry, and, anxious to consummate the marriage, both express a disregard for Fortune. Romeus' determination to come to his bride is described thus:

For whether Fortune smile on him, or if she list to lower,
He will not miss to come to his appointed place.¹⁰

Of course, Romeus succeeds in finding his way to Juliet's bedroom, and, after they passionately greet each other, Juliet reflects her husband's attitude:

But now what is decreed by fatal destiny,
I force it not; let Fortune do, and death, their worst to
me.¹¹

Their pessimism is, of course, to be justified. But it is this precise moment when the lovers are most in Fortune's favor.

Romeus ironically chooses just this moment to blame "cruel Fortune,"¹² for making it impossible for him to demonstrate publicly his love for Juliet, little realizing that Fortune's cruelty is soon to be more amply manifested. The event that acts as a catalyst for the plot is Romeus' duel with Tybalt. The duel and Escalus' sentence of banishment take place on the day after Easter:

At holiest times, men say, most heinous crimes are done;
The morrow after Easter day the mischief new begun.¹³

The implications of this proverb is that God seems to be unconcerned with man, whereas Fortune, responsible for the change in the affairs of man, subjects him to her caprices. Certainly, in the eyes of many of Verona's citizens, particularly the ladies, Fortune and not Romeus is to blame for Tybalt's death and Romeus' banishment:

And other some bewail, but ladies most of all,
The luckless lot by Fortune's guilt that is so late befall,
Without his fault, unto the seely Romeus.¹⁴

Juliet also sees Fortune at work in the duel between Tybalt and Romeus. She curses the window through which Romeus so often climbed lamenting the "fading pleasure as by Fortune straight was reaved."¹⁵ Fainting, Juliet is revived by her nurse, who comforts her with the prediction that Fortune will soon smile upon the lovers again:

With patience arm thyself, for though that Fortune's crime,
Without your fault, to both your griefs, depart you for a
time,
I dare say, for amends of all your present pain,
She will restore your own to you, within a month or twain,
With such contented ease as never erst you had.¹⁶

Against a hostile Fortune, so the Stoic commonplace went, defenses were available, and the nurse's admonition to patience was an obvious and usual one.

Friar Laurence similarly provides Romeus with defenses against Fortune. Having been told of his banishment, Romeus, in despair, reacts violently. He rages against Nature, his birth, the stars, his nurse, the midwife who delivered him, Cupid, and Fortune:

On Fortune eke he railed, he called her deaf and blind,
Unconstant, fond, deceitful, rash, unruthful, and unkind.¹⁷

When Romeus' rage begins to ebb, Friar Laurence admonishes his young friend:

So, if thou still bewEEP
And seek not how to help the changes that do chance,
Thy cause of sorrow shall increase, thou cause of thy mis-
chance.¹⁸

The wise man is not defenseless before Fortune.

A constant mind is the primary shield against Fortune's slings and arrows, Friar Laurence advises. Romeus must control his emotions.

Sickness the body's gaol, grief gaol is of the mind,
 If thou canst 'scape from heavy grief, true freedom shalt
 thou find.

Fortune can fill nothing so full of hearty grief,
 But in the same a constant mind finds solace and relief.¹⁹

There is something to be gained from adversity, the holy man argues;
 the man who has experienced it not only is better prepared for any
 future troubles, but also he has a standard by which to judge any
 future happiness. But first Romeus must

master quite the troubles that thee spill,
 Endeavour first by reason's help to master witless will.²⁰

By allowing his passions to overcome his reason, the young lover aids
 the enemy:

Affection's foggy mist thy feeble sight doth blind;
 But if that reason's beams again might shine into thy mind,
 If thou would'st view thy state with an indifferent eye,
 I think thou would'st condemn thy plaint, thy sighing and
 thy cry.²¹

Friar Laurence's advice, typical of the attitudes taken toward Fortune,
 reflected the classical attitudes available to the literate man. Compare, for example, the very similar comment made by Plutarch in his
 life of Solon:

For it is not love but weaknes, which breedeth these extreme
 sorowes, and exceeding feare, in men that are not exercised,
 nor acquainted to fight against fortune with reason. And
 this is the cause that plucketh from them the pleasure of that
 they love and desire, by reason of the continuall trouble,
 feare and grieffe they feelee, by thincking howe in time they
 maye be deprived of it. Nowe we must not arme ourselves with
 povertie, against the grieffe of losse of goodes: neither with
 lacke of affection, against the losse of our friendes: neither
 with wante of marriage, against the death of children: but
 we must be armed with reason against misfortunes.²²

Having mastered his emotions, a man is then able to defend
 himself against Fortune with his reason, which enables him to under-
 stand that Fortune is cyclical.

The world is alway full of chances and of change,
Wherefore the change of chance must not seem to a wise man
strange.

For tickel Fortune doth, in changing, but her kind,
But all her changes cannot change a steady constant mind.
Though wavering Fortune turn from thee her smiling face,
And Sorrow seek to set himself in banished Pleasure's place,
Yet may thy marréd state be mended in a while,
And she eftsoons that frowneth now, with pleasant cheer shall
smile,

For as her happy state no long while standeth sure,
Even so the heavy plight she brings, not always doth endure.²³

The wise man, Friar Laurence tells Romeus, will be led to this conclusion by his reason. After all, the monk says, had Romeus not been Fortune's victim just before he had enjoyed her favor in winning Juliet? He can look forward to enjoying again the blessings of Fortune with increased pleasure.

Those griefs and others like were haply overpast,
And thou in height of Fortune's wheel well placéd at the
last!

From whence thou art now fall'n, that, raised up again,
With greater joy a greater while in pleasure may'st thou
reign.²⁴

Again, Brooke has Friar Laurence utter commonplace advice concerning the defense against Fortune, advice that was similar to the encouraging words spoken by Aeneas to his discouraged followers on the shores of Libya:

O comrades, for not ere now are we ignorant of ill, O
tried by heavier fortunes, to these also God will appoint an
end. The fury of Scylla and the roaring recesses of her
craggs you have come nigh, and known the rocks of the Cyclops.
Recall your courage, put sorrow and fear away. This too
sometime we shall haply remember with delight. Through
chequered fortunes, through many perilous ways, we steer for
Latium, where destiny points us a quiet home. There the
realm of Troy may rise again unforbidden. Keep heart, and
endure till prosperous fortune come.²⁵

Thus, although the individual cannot escape Fortune, he can soften her blows by remembering her essential nature and acting accordingly;

Friar Laurence, as Aeneas had done, counsels Romeus to endure until his fortunes change:

Compare the present while with times y-past before,
 And think that Fortune hath for thee great pleasure yet in
 store.
 And whilst, this little wrong receive thou patiently,
 And what of force must needs be done, that do thou willingly.
 Folly it is to fear that thou canst not avoid,
 And madness to desire it much that cannot be enjoyed.
 To give to Fortune place, not aye deserveth blame,
 But skill it is, according to the times thyself to frame.²⁶

Romeus at last accepts the friar's arguments as well as his suggestion that he, Romeus, visit Juliet so that he may comfort her before he begins his exile from Verona.

At the farewell meeting, both Romeus and Juliet blame Fortune for their plight, and Romeus, of course, intending to soothe his wife, begins by reminding her of the cyclical nature of Fortune:

My Juliet, my love, my only hope and care,
 To you I purpose not as now with length of words declare
 The diverseness and eke the accidents so strange
 Of frail unconstant Fortune, that delighteth still in change;
 Who in a moment heaves her friends up to the height
 Of her swift-turning slippery wheel, then fleets her friendship
 straight.
 O wondrous change, even with the twinkling of an eye
 Whom erst herself had rashly set in pleasant place so high,
 The same in great despite down headlong doth she throw,
 And while she treads and spurneth at the lofty state laid
 low,
 More sorrow doth she shape within an hour's space,
 Than pleasure in an hundred years; so geason is her grace.²⁷

He also reminds her of the noble motives which led to their marriage and bewails his banishment, all preparatory

to exhort you now to prove yourself a woman wise,
 That patiently you bear my absent long abode,
 For what above by fatal dooms decreed is, that God--²⁸

But before he can pass on Friar Laurence's sage advice about how to deal with Fortune, Juliet, enraged because her lover's talk

seems to be concerned with his fate and not hers, breaks in to rail at him--and Fortune. She would be better off dead, she claims, yet Fortune denies her even that:

Yet such is my mishap, O cruel destiny,
That still I live, and wish for death, but yet can never die;
So that just cause I have to think, as seemeth me,
That froward Fortune did of late with cruel Death agree
To lengthen loathéd life, to pleasure in my pain.²⁹

Romeus himself is described as

the instrument of Fortune's cruel will,
Without whose aid she can no way her tyrannous lust fulfil.³⁰

She proposes either to kill herself or to go into exile with him.

Upon the cessation of her tirade, Romeus has an opportunity to present a remedy for Fortune. He first points out the faults of the alternatives Juliet has mentioned and then largely repeats Friar Laurence's commentary on Fortune. Their situation can only get better, Romeus says,

For Fortune changeth more than fickle fantasy;
In nothing Fortune constant is save in unconstancy.
Her hasty running wheel is of a restless course,
That turns the climbers headlong down, from better to the
worse,
And those that are beneath she heaveth up again:
So we shall rise to pleasure's mount, out of the pit of
pain.³¹

If Fortune is at fault for their plight, as Romeus earlier suggested, then their succor will also be at the hands of Fortune, for her wheel is constantly turning. Juliet, at last, becomes resigned to the situation; and with the first signs of dawn the lovers part, unaware that they are never again to rise up "out of the pit of pain."

Although there are few mentions of Fortune in the poem after the parting of Romeus and Juliet, some of these are relatively significant. Juliet twice conceives of herself as subject to the whims

of the goddess. In her attempt to evade her father's command to marry Paris, she begs Capulet to allow her to continue living unmarried at home, promising never again to be her parent's concern:

Cease all your troubles for my sake, and care for me no more;
But suffer Fortune fierce to work on me her will,
In her it lieth to do me boot, in her it lieth to spill.³²

These lines are highly ironic, for they recall Romeus' prediction that Juliet and he "shall rise . . . out of the pit of pain" even as they forecast Juliet's ultimate fate. Again she accurately describes her role as Fortune's victim when, just after drinking the sleeping potion given her by Friar Laurence, she, perhaps unwittingly, questions whether she is not

of all that yet were born,
The deepest drenched in despair, and most in Fortune's
scorn?³³

The latter line could serve as her epitaph.

In addition, Juliet understands Romeus as the victim of Fortune. Awakening in the tomb to find her lover dead beside her, she asks his corpse,

How could thy dainty youth agree with willing heart,
In this so foul-infected place to dwell, where now thou art?
Where spiteful Fortune hath appointed thee to be
The dainty food of greedy worms, unworthy, sure, of thee.³⁴

Shortly afterward, Juliet, equally unworthy to be "the dainty food of greedy worms," follows Romeus to death. Both are the victims of "spiteful Fortune."

Friar Laurence also ascribes the fate of Romeus and Juliet to Fortune. Beginning his tale of the events which have resulted in the deaths of the two young lovers, he says that there is not a member of his audience who considers

this heavy sight, the wreak of frantic Fortune's rage,
But that, amazed much, doth wonder at this change.³⁵

This description of Fortune sharply contrasts with the impersonal, cyclical description with which the monk had comforted Romeus and signals a shift in Friar Laurence's attitude toward the nature of the forces which govern the world.

By his actions more than his words, Friar Laurence acknowledges that his view of Fortune and the defenses against her he had recommended to Romeus are inadequate. Too late, the good friar realizes the shortcomings of reason. Although he explains to the satisfaction of the citizens and ruler of Verona that he is legally guiltless in the deaths of Romeus and Juliet, Brooke's description of Friar Laurence's fate suggests another kind of guilt:

But now what shall betide of this grey-bearded sire?
Of Friar Laurence thus arraigned, that good barefooted friar?
Because that many times he worthily did serve
The commonwealth, and in his life was never found to swerve,
He was discharged quite, and no mark of defame
Did seem to blot or touch at all the honour of his name.³⁶

That the deaths of the lovers only seemed not to affect the friar, while in fact they did, is indicated by the holy man's voluntary exile from Verona:

But of himself he went into an hermitage,
Two miles from Verona town, where he in prayers passed forth
his age;
Till that from earth to heaven his heavenly sprite did fly,
Five years he lived an hermit and an hermit did he die.³⁷

In his hermitage Friar Laurence will no longer be available to counsel others, nor would he want to, for in a world ruled by Fortune one has a difficult enough time saving his own soul.

And the world of Brooke's poem is a world ruled by Fortune. Of this there can be no doubt. The Romeus and Juliet of the poem are

indeed "unfortunate lovers." Fortune is as important to the poem as Romeus, Juliet, the nurse, or Friar Laurence, for she is the villain of the piece.

Although Farnham states that "the star-crossed lovers" in Romeo and Juliet are "slaves of Fortune in the play very much as they are in Arthur Brooke's poem,"³⁸ a close reading of Shakespeare's play reveals a significant shift in imagery from a single dominant metaphor to a complex of images. The complex of images that dominates in the play does not allow the conclusion that the lovers are Fortune's fools; rather it suggests a world which defies any such simple attempts at understanding. There is no question that Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet closely imitates Brooke's Romeus and Juliet insofar as plot is concerned; but there can be no question that Shakespeare did not limit himself to the imagery of Brooke.

Interestingly, Caroline Spurgeon credits Brooke for the light imagery she sees dominating in the play. "Shakespeare's extraordinary susceptibility to suggestion and readiness to borrow are well exemplified in this running imagery. He took the idea from the last place we should expect, from the wooden doggerel of Arthur Brooke."³⁹ To support her statement she cites a number of passages in Brooke's poem which have parallels in Shakespeare's play, concluding that even though Shakespeare borrowed the imagery from Brooke:

In taking it, he has transformed a few conventional and obvious similes of little poetic worth into a continuous and consistent running image of exquisite beauty, building up a definite picture and atmosphere of brilliance swiftly quenched, which powerfully affects the imagination of the reader.⁴⁰

While Professor Spurgeon is not concerned with the idea of imitation, had she been she could hardly have seen anything "extraordinary"

about "Shakespeare's extraordinary susceptibility to suggestion and readiness to borrow." She would also have understood that, regardless of the execution of the task, Shakespeare was obligated to attempt to improve upon whatever was borrowed or, more accurately, imitated. Nevertheless, her insights concerning the imagery of the play are valuable.

She speaks eloquently:

In Romeo and Juliet the beauty and ardour of young love are seen by Shakespeare as the irradiating glory of sunlight and starlight in a dark world. The dominating image is light, every form and manifestation of it: the sun, moon, stars, fire, lightning, the flash of gunpowder, and the reflected light of beauty and of love; while by contrast we have night, darkness, clouds, rain, mist and smoke.⁴¹

She offers evidence which adequately supports her contention, and her conclusions as to the function of the imagery pleases the mind.

This is:

There can be no question, I think, that Shakespeare saw the story, in its swift and tragic beauty, as an almost blind-⁴² ing flash of light, suddenly ignited, and as swiftly quenched.

Other critics concur with Professor Spurgeon's view that light is the dominating image in Romeo and Juliet. Donald A. Stauffer says that "to convey his vivid intuition of the place and duration of love in the dark world of time, Shakespeare finds the lightning-in-the-night adequate as the germinating and organizing symbol for Romeo and Juliet."⁴³ He describes the contrast as that between "the dark shades of hate" and "the brilliant lightning flash of passion."⁴⁴

Ifor Evans concentrates on the settings implied by the play in reaching a similar conclusion about the light imagery:

Throughout, darkness and light are brought into contrast, until they dwell in the memory as a symbol of the tragic contrast of

love and death which encircles the young lovers. Much of this is established outside the language, by the setting of the scenes themselves, with night, and the light of torches upon the night, the dawn, the bright sunlight, and straight keen shadows of the Italian day. The "rich jewel in an Ethiop's ear" supplies the emotional image of the play, which the setting has confirmed.⁴⁵

The eloquence with which Spurgeon, Stauffer, and Evans express their views is persuasive, yet it is not finally convincing.

Certainly, the imagery of light is important in the play, but it alone does not dominate. For the images of Romeo and Juliet are drawn from various areas of human interest: birds, animals, flowers, and fruit; the night, the stars, the moon, and the sun; Fortune, religion, and love; books, weapons, and ships--images alluding to these subjects and more are to be found in the play. Unlike the author of the poem he imitated, however, Shakespeare does not dwell on any single image or single group of related images.

Since there are only a handful of references, Fortune can be dismissed as a dominant image. Of course, it is easy to see how critics such as Farnham would be tempted by the idea that Shakespeare imitated Brooke, for there are lines such as Romeo's "O I am fortunes foole,"⁴⁶ and Juliet's

O Fortune, Fortune, all men call thee fickle,
If thou art fickle, what dost thou with him
That is renowned for faith: be fickle Fortune:
For then I hope thou wilt not keepe him long,
But send him backe.⁴⁷

Supporting these few clear-cut references to Fortune in the play is the star imagery, such as the line in the prologue which identifies Romeo and Juliet as "a paire of starre-crost lovers"⁴⁸ and Romeo's

for my mind misgives,
Some consequence yet hanging in the starres,

Shall bitterly begin his fearfull date,
With this nights revels.⁴⁹

This imagery provides yet another metaphor for the idea of chance operating in the universe, but both Fortune and the stars were common-places of the period. And they are mentioned infrequently and without any recognizable patterning in the play.

The single most revealing passage in the play is Romeo's rhapsodic description of Juliet:

O she doth teach the torches to burn bright:
It seemes she hangs upon the cheeke of night:
As a rich Jewel in an Ethiops eare,
Bewtie too rich for use, for earth too deare:
So showes a snowie Dove trooping with Crowes,
As yonder Lady ore her fellowes showes:
The measure done, Ile watch her place of stand,
And touching hers, make blessed my rude hand.⁵⁰

These eight lines not only exemplify three important areas of imagery --light, wealth, and religion--but, more importantly, they exemplify the inversion or confusion which is characteristic of the imagery. The beauty of the lines tends to conceal these inversions, but the implications are very clear. There is first the paradox that Juliet's beauty, mortal and mundane, is "too rich for use, for earth too deare." More importantly, there is Romeo's confusion about the holiness of Juliet. Love has blinded him into believing a mortal is a saint.

Throughout, Romeo and Juliet employ religious imagery to describe love or the person beloved. Their first conversation sees Romeo continuing the metaphor introduced in his suggestion that Juliet is a saint:

Ro. If I prophane with my unworthiest hand,
This holy shrine, the gentle sin is this,
My lips two blushing Pylgrims did readie stand,
To smoothe that rough touch with a tender kis.

Ju. Good Pilgrim you do wrōg your hād too much
Which mannerly devocion showes in this,
For saints have hands, that Pilgrims hands do tuch,
And palme to palme is holy Palmers kis.

Ro. Have not Saints lips and holy Palmers too?

Ju. I Pilgrim, lips that they must use in praire.

Ro. O then deare Saint, let lips do what hands do,
They pray (grant thou) least faith turne to dispaire.

Ju. Saints do not move, thogh grant for praiers sake.

Ro. Then move not while my praiers effect I take.
Thus from my lips, by thine my sin is purgd.

Ju. Thē have my lips the sin that they have tooke.

Ro. Sin from my lips, ô trespas sweetly urgd:
Give me my sin againe.

Ju. Youe kisse bith booke.⁵¹

In this delightful and witty exchange Romeo begins his relationship with Juliet with the elaborate conceit equating her to a saint, and she, as any proper young lady should, gracefully slips into the role, modestly attempting to divert the worship of herself by reminding him of the legitimate object of his devotion. She, of course, fails.

The balcony scene continues the religious imagery. Juliet appears on her balcony and sighs; Romeo overhears and says

Oh speake againe bright Angel, for thou art
As glorious to this night being ore my head,
As is a winged messenger of heaven
Unto the white upturned wondring eyes,
Of mortalls that fall backe to gaze on him,
When he bestrides the lazie puffing Cloudes,
And sayles upon the bosome of the ayre.⁵²

Here, Romeo, by calling Juliet an angel, identifies love as a kind of religion; however, by distinguishing between himself and ordinary mortals, he discriminates his worship from theirs. Romeo also offers to renounce his name, saying "Call me but love, and Ile be new baptizde."⁵³ Juliet is thus made capable of priestly functions.

It is during the balcony scene that Juliet is converted to the worship of love. Up to this point there has been a distinguishable difference in the attitudes of the two young lovers toward each other. Her conversion is signaled when she asks Romeo to "swear not by the moone, th' inconstant moone."⁵⁴ Romeo asks to be told where he should direct his oaths and Juliet commands:

Do not sweare at all:
Or if thou wilt, sweare by thy gracious selfe,
Which is the god of my Idolatrie,
And Ile beleeeve thee.⁵⁵

As Romeo has done before, she attaches divinity to the person loved. Although to him she is an angel, to her Romeo is a god. But by calling her worship "Idolatrie" Juliet acknowledges that she has perverted religion.

• Other, less obvious, instances of religious imagery refer to the relationship between the two lovers in this scene. To Romeo, the night is "blessed"; and twice he calls Juliet his "soul." Juliet tells Romeo to return instructions about their marriage

By one that ile procure to come to thee,
Where and what time thou wilt performe the right,
And all my fortunes at thy foote ile lay,
And follow thee my L. throughout the world.⁵⁶

While innocent enough at first glance, these lines reinforce the suggestion of idolatry that Juliet has already introduced. The words "right" and lord are not misused to refer to the marriage ceremony and a husband, but they are particularly suggestive in conjunction with the image of sacrifice occurring in the words "all my fortunes at thy foote ile lay." Later in the play Juliet and Paris are to use "right" to refer to an action not properly religious: Juliet, longing for the arrival of Romeo, urges night on; lovers

need no light, for "lovers can see to do their amorous rights" even in darkness,⁵⁷ and Paris, strewing flowers on Juliet's tomb, warned of Romeo's approach, wonders who is to disturb his "true loves right."⁵⁸

Juliet's view of Romeo as the object of her worship is also illustrated by her description of her nurse. The practical old woman counsels Juliet to consent to her father's wishes and marry Paris. Juliet should ignore her marriage to Romeo; he, after all, is banished and therefore dare not object. After the nurse leaves, Juliet says:

Auncient damnation, ô most wicked fiend,
Is it more sin to wish me thus forsworne,
Or to dispraise my Lord with that same tongue,
Which she hath praisde him with above compare,
So many thousand times?⁵⁹

The sins of the nurse, who is here called a devil, are not against Christianity, but against love. Romeo is Juliet's divinity, her "Lord."

Yet another example of the lovers' inversion of religion occurs when Romeo responds to Friar Laurence's attempts to comfort him after he has been exiled. The prince has been lenient, Laurence argues; exile is "deare mercie." Romeo passionately disagrees:

Tis torture and not mercie, heaven is here
Where Juliet lives, and every cat and dog,
And little mouse, every unworthy thing
Live here in heaven, and may looke on her,
But Romeo may not. More validitie,
More honourable state, more courtship lives
In carrion flies, then Romeo: they may seaze
On the white wonder of deare Juliets hand,
And steale immortall blessing from her lips,
Who even in pure and vestall modestie
Still blush, as thinking their owne kisses sin.⁶⁰

These lines reiterate the metaphor of Juliet as a goddess whose divinity is attested to by the "white wonder" of her hand and the

"immortall blessing" of her lips, themselves "pure and vestall" priestesses serving their owner. Very clearly, then, religious imagery describes the way in which each of the two lovers sees the other, but just as clearly the idea of inversion is suggested, for the temple of the lovers is Cupid's in which the deity of each is the other.

As has been noted, there is an abundance of light imagery in the play, and this imagery cannot be ignored, even though it alone does not dominate. Whatever else the light imagery of the play does, it inverts the more usual time for human action, which, particularly in a period when technology permitted only imperfect artificial light, is the day. An odd, but seldom noticed, fact is that except for the very short marriage scene at the end of Act II, the lovers are together only at night. Night, of course, is the appropriate time for lovers, but it also has an important metaphorical function, allowing the audience to see the lovers as brief, but brilliant, candles illuminating the darkness surrounding all human life.

Romeo, for example, has an unusual affinity for the night. Even before Romeo meets Juliet, his father comments on his son's habits. After being told that his son had been seen in the woods but had shunned company, Mountague says that others have seen him there and adds

But all so soone, as the alcheering Sunne,
Should in the farthest East begin to draw,
The shadie curtaines from Auroras bed,
Away from light steales home my heavie sonne,
And private in his Chamber pennes himselfe,
Shuts up his windowes, locks faire day-light out,
And makes himselfe an artificall night.⁶¹

Mountague makes it abundantly clear that he considers such actions abnormal; not only is the daylight "faire," but Romeo's humor is "blacke and portendous."⁶² Benvolio echoes this opinion early in the second act when he discusses, with Mercutio, Romeo's leap over the wall that bounds Capulet's orchard. Romeo, says Benvolio,

hath hid himselfe among these trees
To be consorted with the humerous night:
Blind is his love, and best befits the darke.⁶³

In the eyes of his father and his friends, Romeo is unreasonable, for only the unreasonable would shun the light of day. But at the end of the play it is clear that night is Romeo's natural habitat and ultimate destiny.

From his very first sight of her, Romeo describes Juliet in terms of light, and darkness is the prerequisite condition for her brilliance. She teaches "the torches to burn bright"; she is an Ethiopian's earring hanging "upon the cheek of night." On her balcony Juliet is not only the sun, but her eyes are stars whose brightness would shame actual stars; and her cheeks, if placed in the heavens, would fool the birds by making night seem day. She is a "bright Angel," who, like a star, is

As glorious to this night being ore my head,
As is a winged messenger of heaven.⁶⁴

Even when Romeo thinks she is dead, he uses a light metaphor to describe her. Addressing the corpse of Paris, Romeo recognizes the similarity of their situations:

O give me thy hand,
One writ with me in sowe misfortunes booke,
Ile burie thee in a triumphant grave.
A Grave, O no. A Lanthorne slaughtred youth:
For here lies Juliet, and her bewtie makes
This Vault a feasting presence full of light.⁶⁵

The lines are highly ironic, for Romeo fails to recognize that Juliet's light of life has not failed, even though he does, for the first time in the play, recognize the possibility that others can love as deeply as he. Heretofore, Romeo has been blinded by Juliet's brilliance, a brightness seen only at night.

Juliet also describes her lover in terms of light. As she awaits him on the night of their marriage, she impatiently urges night on:

Gallop apace, you fierie footed steedes,
Towards Phoebus lodging, such a wagoner
As Phaetan would whip you to the west,
And bring in clowdie night immediately.
Spread thy close curtaine, love-performing night,
That runnawayes eyes may wincke, and Romeo
Leape to these armes, untalkt of and unseene,
Lovers can see to do their amorous rights,
And by their owne bewties, or if love be blind,
It best agrees with night, come civill night,
Thou sober suted matron all in blacke,
.
Come night, come Romeo, come thou day in night,
For thou wilt lie upon the winges of night,
Whiter then new snow upon a Ravens backe:
Come gentle night, come loving black browd night,
Give me my Romeo, and when I shall die,
Take him and cut him out in little starres,
And he will make the face of heaven so fine,
That all the world will be in love with night,
And pay no worship to the garish Sun.⁶⁶

Romeo's brilliance is contrasted throughout this passage with that of the sun. While he is no rival in brightness, his handsomeness will, however, furnish sufficient light for lovers' "amorous rights"; but the quality of his light exceeds that of the "garish Sun," for Romeo, if made into stars, would make the night more lovely than the day.

Since night is the necessary condition for the brilliance of the lovers, the light of day is anathema to them. Nowhere in the

play is their hostility toward day made more explicit than at their parting after their single night of love. They appear at the window of Juliet's bedroom and Juliet argues they have heard the nightingale, not the lark. Gently, Romeo insists

It was the Larke the herauld of the morne,
No Nightingale, looke love what envious streakes
Do lace the severing cloudes in yonder East.⁶⁷

Romeo's description of the first light of day as "envious" suggests their feelings about daylight. Juliet pleads that he stay; the light they see is not daylight. Romeo chivalrously agrees to stay and be executed for defying the prince's decree; if Juliet says that they do not see the dawning of the day, then

Ile say yon gray is not the mornings eye,
Tis but the pale reflex of Cinthias brow.⁶⁸

Reminded of the consequences, Juliet admits it was the lark they heard whose song is

Hunting thee hence, with Huntsup to the day.
O now be gone, more light and light it growes.⁶⁹

Romeo's response again suggests his feelings about daylight: "More light and light, more darke and darke our woes." The idea of this line is echoed by Juliet's, "Then window let day in, and let life out." Blinded by their love, Romeo and Juliet have inverted the customary roles of daylight as the symbol of life and night as that of death. They are soon to know that neither day nor night affords life to them.

Night, the antithesis of light, ultimately represents death to the lovers. Just before Juliet drinks the sleeping potion furnished her by Friar Laurence, she associates death and night. Will she awaken before Romeo comes to rescue her? And, if she does, is

it not possible that "the horrible conceit of death and night,"⁷⁰ together with the terror of the tomb, will drive her to madness? Romeo, too, suggests the equivalence of death and night when he calls the Capulets' tomb "this pallat of dym night."⁷¹ The lovers' equation of death and night is reinforced by Capulet's grim pun about Tybalt's death, "the Sunset of my brothers sonne."⁷² Thus, night is something more than a setting which permits love to shine; it is death over which love's brief candle can win only an illusory victory.

To the lovers death is terrible, but the loss of love is even more terrible. Romeo says to Friar Laurence:

Do thou but close our hands with holy words,
Then love-devouring death do what he dare,
It is inough I may but call her mine.⁷³

The image is echoed by Romeo's words as he struggles to pry open the door of the Capulets' tomb:

Thou detestable mawe, thou wombe of death,
Gorg'd with the dearest morsell of the earth:
Thus I enforce thy rotten Jawes to open,
And in despite ile cram thee with more foode.⁷⁴

To him, death is that which "hath suckt the honey" of Juliet's "breath,"⁷⁵ that which is the "leane abhorred monster."⁷⁶ But Romeo's view of death is not shared by the nurse, Capulet, or Friar Laurence. The nurse's attitude is a matter-of-fact "Deaths the end of all."⁷⁷ Capulet, at least until he loses his daughter, is perhaps slightly more philosophical. His comment on Tybalt's death, "Well we were borne to die,"⁷⁸ implies an acceptance of death. Finally, there is Friar Laurence's abstract and most philosophical view:

The earth that's natures mother is her tombe,
What is her burying grave, that is her wombe.⁷⁹

Romeo's words at the Capulets' tomb provide a bitter contrast to

Friar Laurence's philosophy. The contrast between these views is doubly important. It strengthens the audience's understanding of the love shared by Romeo and Juliet and, more importantly, it raises the question of which view to accept.

A third large group of images in the play is drawn from wealth and its measurement. The nurse, for example, initially refuses money offered her by Romeo; she is serving as a handmaiden to love.⁸⁰ Juliet's father is twice described as "rich Capulet," once by one of his servants and once by Romeo.⁸¹ Paris, utilizing a hidden metaphor, describes the families of Capulet and Mountague as being "of honourable reckoning."⁸² Capulet, inviting Paris to his ball, tells the young man that he shall "inherit" the sight of lovely young women there.⁸³ Paris himself is initially described to Juliet by her mother as a rich and valuable book:

That booke in manies eyes doth share the glorie
That in gold claspes locks in the golden storie:
So shall you share all that he doth possesse,
By having him, making your selfe no lesse.⁸⁴

In at least two instances humor depends on the imagery of wealth. On the day following the ball, Romeo and Mercutio exchange witticisms:

Mer. you gave us the
counterfeit fairly last night.

Ro. Goodmorrow to you both, what counterfeit
did I give you?

Mer. The slip sir, the slip, can you not
conceive?⁸⁵

Mercutio's conceit is a pun on the word "slip," which denoted a piece of counterfeit money as well as evasion of pursuit. Similar puns are made by the minstrels and Capulet's servant, Peter, who

asks them to explicate a line he has just sung. The line is: "Then musique with her silver sound." Peter then asks:

Why silver sound, why musique, with her silver sound,
what say you Simon Catling?

Min. Mary sir, because silver hath a sweet sound.

Pet. Prates, what say you Hugh Rebick?

2nd Min. I say silver sound, because Musitions
sound for silver.

Pet. Prates to, what say you James Soundpost?

3rd Min. Faith I know not what to say.

Pet. O I cry you mercy, you are the singer. I will
say for you, it is musique with her silver sound, because
Musitions have no gold for sounding.⁸⁶

Romeo, early in the play, employs the imagery of wealth when describing Rosaline. She is immune to love; not only do the conventional weapons of lovers fail to win her, she will not even "ope her lap to saint seducing gold."⁸⁷ Romeo also says,

O she is rich, in bewtie onely poore,
That when she dies, with bewtie dies her store.⁸⁸

These lines foreshadow the death of Juliet, who is even richer than Rosaline in beauty. Romeo, who has not yet met Juliet, denies that he can "forget to thinke" of Rosaline, for

He that is strooken blind, cannot forget
The precious treasure of his eye-sight lost.⁸⁹

Thus, Rosaline is of as great value to him as eyesight to a blind man. The possibility that he might be wrong in his evaluation of Rosaline is suggested by Benvolio, who dares Romeo to attend the Capulets' feast; of Rosaline, Benvolio says

Tut you saw her faire none else being by,
Her selfe poysd with her selfe in either eye:
But in that Christall scales let there be waide,
Your Ladies love against some other maide:
That I will shew you shining at this feast,
And she shall scant shew well that now seemes best.⁹⁰

In this metaphor eyes are compared to scales, possibly like those used by a goldsmith, and the adjective "shining" suggests the glow of a precious metal. Benvolio's prediction is, of course, borne out.

Romeo similarly describes Juliet by using the imagery of wealth. It will be recalled that at his first sight of her he says she is

As a rich Jewel in an Ethiops eare,
Bewtie too rich for use, for earth too deare.⁹¹

And, when he asks the nurse who Juliet is, she answers that Juliet is Capulet's daughter and adds

I tell you, he that can lay hold of her
Shall have the chincks.⁹²

Romeo's response continues the imagery of wealth introduced by the nurse:

Is she a Capulet?
O deare account! my life is my foes debt.⁹³

Later, below Juliet's window, Romeo says to her that he was led to her by love, and in a metaphor mingling the imagery of sea and ships and worth he compliments her by adding

yet wert thou as farre
As that vast shore washeth with the farthest sea,
I should adventure for such marchandise.⁹⁴

Just before their marriage, both Romeo and Juliet utilize the imagery of wealth in assessing their happiness.

Ro. Ah Juliet, if the measure of thy joy
Be heapt like mine, and that thy skill be more
To blason it, then sweeten with thy breath
This neighbour ayre and let rich musicke tongue,
Unfold the imagind happines that both
Receive in either, by this deare encounter.

Ju. Conceit more rich in matter then in words,
 Brags of his substance, not of ornament,
 They are but beggers that can count their worth,
 But my true love is growne to such excesse
 I cannot sum up sum of halfe my wealth.⁹⁵

Romeo's lines allude to music as well as wealth, but Juliet is quick to see the allusions to wealth and extends them. Called upon to estimate the value of their love, she places it beyond her powers of accounting.

Romeo's last use of the imagery of wealth in the play illustrates his contempt of life and its goods. Having learned of Juliet's death, he resolves to return to Verona and die by her side. He remembers an apothecary lives nearby and, after describing the poverty-stricken appearance of the shop, comments

Noting this penury, to my selfe I said,
 An if a man did need a poyson now,
 Whose sale is present death in Mantua,
 Here lives a Catiffe wretch would sell it him.
 O this same thought did but forerun my need,
 And this same needie man must sell it me.⁹⁶

He calls the apothecary out with

Come hither man, I see that thou art poore,
 Hold, there is fortie duckets, let me have
 A dram of poyson.⁹⁷

The apothecary expresses his reluctance to sell Romeo the poison; he is afraid of Mantua's law which prescribes death to anyone vending such drugs. Romeo scorns the excuse offered and alludes to the apothecary's poverty:

Art thou so bare and full of wretchednesse,
 And fearest to die, famine is in thy cheekes,
 Need and oppression starveth in thy eyes,
 Contempt and beggerie hangs upon thy backe:
 The world is not thy friend, nor the worlds law,
 The world affoordes no law to make thee rich:
 Then be not poore, but breake it and take this.⁹⁸

The apothecary reluctantly agrees to sell Romeo the poison, excusing himself by saying, "My povertie, but not my will consents."⁹⁹ Romeo pays him, and as he does he says,

- There is thy Gold, worse poyson to mens soules,
 Doing more murther in this loathsome world,
 Then these poor cōpounds that thou maiest not sell,
 I sell thee poyson, thou hast sold me none.¹⁰⁰

Implicit in these lines is a harsh criticism of the world. That which poisons in the world is wealth, yet it is wealth which men strive after, thereby making poverty a stronger force than man's will. In such a world only love makes life worthwhile, and to live after love is dead is worse than death itself.

The imagery of wealth illuminates the final scene in the play. Following the deaths of Romeo and Juliet, the heads of their families become reconciled in the streets of Verona. Outwardly, there seems to be reestablishment of harmony as the two old men make peace:

Cap. O brother Mountague, give me thy hand,
 This is my daughters joynture, for no more
 Can I demaund.

Mou. But I can give thee more,
 For I will raie her statue in pure gold,
 That whiles Verona by that name is knowne,
 There shall no figure at such rate be set,
 As that of true and faithfull Juliet.

Cap. As rich shall Romeos by his Ladies lie,
 Poore sacrifices of our enmitie.¹⁰¹

Here are two old men whose families have indeed paid a terrible price for their enmity. Mountague has lost his wife and only son. Capulet has lost his nephew and only daughter. In the face of all this death, Capulet reconciles himself to Mountague in terms of wealth; as his daughter's marriage settlement he asks only Mountague's friendship.

Immediately, a grotesque sort of rivalry begins anew between these two heads of families, neither of whom can hope to see the direct perpetuation of his line. No longer able to rival each other as enemies, they will continue the rivalry as friends. Mountague will build a monument to Juliet which will feature her golden statue, a statue which will defy comparison. Not so, answers his new friend, Capulet; Romeo's will be as rich. Our last sight of Mountague and Capulet shows the two old men engaging in what is nearly an opera bouffé scene which ignores the really significant fact, that the two dead lovers have no use for the proposed memorials, especially, when Romeo's words to the apothecary are remembered, golden ones. Monuments must always be for the living, not the dead.

Fortune ruled the world in Brooke's poem, but no such simple explanation of the world is afforded by Shakespeare's play.¹⁰² There are, rather, multiple attitudes toward the world evidenced by the various characters.

The rivalry of Mountague and Capulet illustrates the fiercely competitive outlook needed by the heads of large families whose ultimate responsibility was to the family and not to the individual, an attitude toward the world which would be more understandable at a time when one's family connections very often were the most important determinant of success in the world for the individual. Understandable also is Friar Laurence's attitude that a divine providence guides man, for in an age of almost universal belief in Christianity one would expect any monk to have such an outlook. However, among the living, he is probably the one individual most affected by the tragic outcome of the play. It will be remembered that the final

scene of Act II opens with Friar Laurence and Romeo entering the monk's cell; as they appear, Friar Laurence says the closing words of a prayer:

So smile the heavens upon this holy act,
That after houres, with sorrow chide us not.¹⁰³

The events of the play show that his prayer is not to be granted, and in our concern for the fates of the young lovers we are in danger of overlooking the implications of this failure of prayer. Since a common striving toward comfort consisted in reiterating one's trust in the ultimate providence of God, it was shocking for the religious to be confronted with doubt that the tragedy of Romeo and Juliet served only as prelude to the divine comedy. However, the failure of prayer did indicate that, as a religious man, Friar Laurence was in a condition of spiritual pain, for it was also reiterated that the "merit of prayer depends on the faith of the suppliant."¹⁰⁴ The outcome of the play raised serious doubts, in Friar Laurence's mind at least, about his faith.

More sure of himself is Prince Escalus, for his role as the political leader of Verona necessitates his explanation of the tragedy as the price that must be paid for the civil disorder caused by the feud between the Capulets and Mountagues. To the heads of the families he says,

See what a scourge is laide upon your hate?
That heaven finds means to kil your joyes with love,
And I for winking at your discords too,
Have lost a brace of kinsmen, all are punisht.¹⁰⁵

There is a temptation to see in this judgment of Prince Escalus the reestablishment of order in the world of the play, a temptation to assert that the young lovers have not died in vain. Such an

interpretation is plausible and, for many of the play's contemporary audience, probable. Yet, when the ending of Hamlet is remembered, it will be seen that Shakespeare is in Romeo and Juliet employing the same technique with which he concluded the later play, and that is to draw us out of the immediate sequence of dramatic events by reminding us that the world of the characters in whom we have been so deeply immersed is only a part of a larger world.

Despite the words of Prince Escalus, as we withdraw from Verona, we are unable to forget the terrible fate of Romeo and Juliet. For the two young lovers none of the interpretations of the world--the religious, the political, or the social--was adequate to forestall their doom. In the end it is their doom which moves us, and questions about providence, fortune, and princely duty are irrelevant. Instead, we wonder what sort of a world it is in which such a tragedy can happen and suddenly realize, with a shock, that it is the one in which we live.

NOTES

1. Caroline F.E. Spurgeon, Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935), p. 5.
2. Arthur Brooke, Brooke's "Romeus and Juliet" Being the Original of Shakespeare's "Romeo and Juliet" Newly Edited by J. J. Munro (New York: Duffield and Company, 1908), ll. 1-15.
3. Ibid., ll. 25-28.
4. Ibid., ll. 908-914.
5. Ibid., ll. 933-949.
6. Ibid., ll. 951-952.
7. Ibid., ll. 154, 152.
8. Ibid., ll. 357.
9. Ibid., ll. 327-328.
10. Ibid., ll. 818-819.
11. Ibid., ll. 859-860.
12. Ibid., l. 865.
13. Ibid., ll. 959-960.
14. Ibid., ll. 1059-1061.
15. Ibid., l. 1102.
16. Ibid., ll. 1223-1227.
17. Ibid., ll. 1343-1344.
18. Ibid., ll. 1378-1380.
19. Ibid., ll. 1389-1392.
20. Ibid., ll. 1399-1400.
21. Ibid., ll. 1419-1422.

22. Plutarch, Plutarch's Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans, tr. Sir Thomas North (London: David Nutt, 1895), I, 214.
23. Brooke, ll. 1403-1412.
24. Ibid., ll. 1469-1472.
25. Virgil, Virgil's Works, tr. J. W. Mackail (New York: The Modern Library, 1934), p. 8.
26. Brooke, ll. 1473-1479.
27. Ibid., ll. 1543-1554.
28. Ibid., ll. 1572-1574.
29. Ibid., ll. 1585-1589.
30. Ibid., ll. 1591-1592.
31. Ibid., ll. 1667-1672.
32. Ibid., ll. 1920-1922.
33. Ibid., ll. 2351-2352.
34. Ibid., ll. 2743-2746.
35. Ibid., ll. 2840-2841.
36. Ibid., ll. 2995-3000.
37. Ibid., ll. 3001-3004.
38. Willard Farnham, The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963), pp. 397-398.
39. Spurgeon, p. 314.
40. Ibid., pp. 315-316.
41. Ibid., p. 310.
42. Ibid., p. 312.
43. Donald A. Stauffer, Shakespeare's World of Images (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1949), p. 54.
44. Ibid.
45. B. Ifor Evans, The Language of Shakespeare's Plays (London: Methuen & Company, Ltd, 1952), p. 60.

46. William Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet, Second Quarto, 1599, Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles No. 6, ed. W. W. Greg (London: The Shakespeare Association and Sidgwick and Jackson, Ltd, 1949), III.i.141.
47. Ibid., III.v.60-64.
48. Ibid., Prologue, l. 6.
49. Ibid., I.iv.106-109.
50. Ibid., I.v.46-53. Compare with Sonnet XXVII:

my soul's imaginary sight
Presents thy shadow to my sightless view,
Which, like a jewel hung in ghastly night,
Makes black night beauteous and her old face new.
51. Ibid., I.v.95-112.
52. Ibid., II.ii.26-32.
53. Ibid., II.ii.50.
54. Ibid., II.ii.109.
55. Ibid., II.ii.112-115.
56. Ibid., II.ii.145-148.
57. Ibid., III.ii.8.
58. Ibid., V.iii.20.
59. Ibid., III.v.235-239.
60. Ibid., III.iii.29-39.
61. Ibid., I.i.140-146.
62. Ibid., I.i.147.
63. Ibid., II.i.30-32.
64. Ibid., II.ii.27-28.
65. Ibid., V.iii.81-86.
66. Ibid., III.ii.1-11, 17-25.
67. Ibid., III.v.6-8.
68. Ibid., III.v.19-20.

69. Ibid., III.v.34-35.
70. Ibid., IV.iii.37.
71. Ibid., V.iii.107.
72. Ibid., III.v.129.
73. Ibid., II.vi.6-8.
74. Ibid., V.iii.45-48.
75. Ibid., V.iii.92.
76. Ibid., V.iii.104.
77. Ibid., III.iii.92.
78. Ibid., III.iv.4.
79. Ibid., II.iii.9-10.
80. Ibid., II.iv.194-196.
81. Ibid., I.ii.83 and II.iii.58.
82. Ibid., I.ii.4.
83. Ibid., I.ii.30.
84. Ibid., I.iii.91-94.
85. Ibid., II.iv.46-51.
86. Ibid., IV.v.128-144.
87. Ibid., I.i.220.
88. Ibid., I.i.221-222.
89. Ibid., I.i.238-239.
90. Ibid., I.ii.99-104.
91. Ibid., I.v.48-49.
92. Ibid., I.v.118-119.
93. Ibid., I.v.119-120.
94. Ibid., II.ii.82-84.
95. Ibid., II.vi.24-34. Italics mine, except for proper names.

96. Ibid., V.i.49-54.
97. Ibid., V.i.58-60.
98. Ibid., V.i.68-74.
99. Ibid., V.i.75.
100. Ibid., V.i.80-83.
101. Ibid., V.iii.296-304. Italics mine, except for proper names.
102. For an opposing view, see H. B. Charlton, Shakespearian Tragedy (Cambridge: The University Press, 1949), p. 51. Among other comments, the following is pertinent:

Though Romeo and Juliet is set in a modern Christian country, with church and priest and full ecclesiastical institution, the whole universe of God's justice, vengeance and providence is discarded and rejected from the directing forces of the play's dramatic movement. In its place, there is a theatrical resuscitation of the half-barbarian, half-Roman deities of Fate and Fortune.
103. Shakespeare, II.vi.1-2.
104. Faye L. Kelly, Prayer in Sixteenth-Century England (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1966), p. 31.
105. Shakespeare, V.iii.292-295.

CHAPTER THREE

This chapter is concerned with the relationship between Lodge's Rosalynde and Shakespeare's imitation of that work, As You Like It.¹ An analysis of the imagery of the romance shows that it has no image or body of imagery which expands its meaning. Thus, Shakespeare in imitating Lodge could not have borrowed his imagery even if he had so desired. He invests his play with an imagery drawn from nature which succeeds in portraying a world bearing a close resemblance to England; but he also employs a body of imagery relating to wealth, which suggests that the major action takes place in an ideal world. The commentary on the extensive nature imagery was originally made by Professor Caroline Spurgeon; that on the imagery of wealth is new.

As is the case with Romeo and Juliet and its source, the critics agree that Lodge's romance, itself based in part on The Tale of Gamelyn, was the source of Shakespeare's As You Like It. As long ago as 1794 certain similarities in language were noted between Rosalynde and As You Like It by Whiter. "It is extremely curious," he said, "that Shakespeare has caught many words, and even turns of expression, belonging to the novel from which the play was taken; though he has applied them in a mode generally different and often very remote from the original."² Furness, the thoroughgoing editor of the Variorum, prints Rosalynde as an appendix to his

edition of As You Like It and in the margin notes approximately twenty-seven parallels between the two works which various of the critics have remarked upon.³

Many of these similarities are indeed "very remote from the original." Some can be explained by the circumstance that Lodge and Shakespeare shared the same language as well as the same general body of knowledge, a circumstance that would have made some repetition inevitable. For example, the following sentence appears in Rosalynde: "But she [Phoebe] measuring all his passions with a coye disdain, and triumphing in the poore Shepheardes patheticall humours, smiling at his martyrdome, as though love had been no maladie, scornfully warbled out this Sonnet."⁴ In the play, Ganimed warns Orlando that, if he fails to keep his appointment to make love to the surrogate Rosalind, she "will thinke you the most patheticall breake-promise."⁵ The sole resemblance between these two sentences resides in the word "patheticall." Yet, Whiter, claiming that the word means the same in both places, suggests that "Shakespeare, perhaps, caught this word from Lodge's Novel."⁶ That scholar's diligence in so closely comparing the source and the play is to be admired, but his "perhaps" barely rescues him from absurdity.

There are other examples of such attempts to connect the romance and the play. In Rosalynde, Saladyne, the eldest brother, laments to himself that his youthful faults showed "little nourture,"⁷ and Furness reminds us of Orlando's speech to Duke Senior wherein the young hero modestly claims that, although he is "in-land bred," he nevertheless knows "some nourture."⁸ The futility of attaching much significance to this parallel is indicated by Steevens' comment

that the word was often used as early as 1580 to refer to education, breeding, and manners.⁹ Obviously, a common language is as likely a reason for such echoes as is any necessary connection between the two works. Evidence such as Whiter and Furness cite best supports the proposition that scholars read extremely closely but sometimes do not exercise much judgment when mustering their facts in support of a hypothesis.

A second group of echoes better indicates the close relationship between Lodge's romance and Shakespeare's play, for it reveals that Shakespeare often saw certain of his characters in very much the same way that Lodge pictured them. In Rosalynde, for example, Saladyne characterizes his deficiency in the arts of war by saying to Rosader, "Thou knowest though I am eldest by birth, yet never having attempted any deedes of Armes, I am yongest to performe any Martiall exploytes, knowing better how to survey my lands, than to charge my Launce."¹⁰ This paradox survives in Shakespeare, although the statement is shortened and put into the mouth of Orlando. Responding to a threat from Oliver, he says, "Come, come elder brother, you are too yong in this."¹¹

Another such example of similar characterization is provided by Rosalynde's justification of her disguise. In the romance she says to Alinda, "I . . . am of a tall stature, and would very well become the person and apparell of a page."¹² In the play Rosalind says to Celia,

Were it not better,
Because that I am more then common tall,
That I did suite me all points like a man.¹³

In the matter of Rosalind's height Shakespeare is obviously imitating

Lodge closely. The motivation for the disguise is likewise the same in romance and play. In the former, Alinda expresses trepidation about two women traveling alone and wishes that they might have male companionship. In the play Rosalind is the fearful one: she says,

Alas, what danger will it be to us,
(Maides as we are) to travell forth so farre?
Beautie provoketh theeves sooner then gold.¹⁴

It is at this point Rosalind hits upon the device of disguising herself as a man. Parenthetically, it might be pointed out that their decision to take Touchstone along with them very nearly eliminates the motive for the disguise, but the scene quickly rushes on to its end, leaving little time for the audience to ponder this inconsistency.

There are other echoes which suggest in another, and perhaps more subtle, way Shakespeare's debt to Lodge. Some are extremely faint. For example, in Rosalynde, Montanus sings a song in which a dove is described as being surrounded by "the citizens of Wood,"¹⁵ that is, the animals of the forest. In the play the exiled duke expresses his reluctance to hunt deer:

And yet it irkes me the poore dapled fooles
Being native Burgers of this desert City,
Should intheir [sic] owne confines with forked heads
Have their round hanches goard.¹⁶

Although it is possible that Shakespeare and Lodge could have independently hit upon the metaphor, it is more probable that Shakespeare, perhaps unconsciously, echoed Lodge.

On the other hand, an unmistakable echo is that proverbial accusation directed toward Ganimede by Aliena, which serves to remind the disguised girl of her sex: "Only a foul bird would defile its own nest."¹⁷ This same idea is expressed by Celia in the play;

berating Rosalind, she says:

You have simply misus'd our sexe in your love-prate:
we must have your doublet and hose pluckt over your
head, and shew the world what the bird hath done to
her owne neast.¹⁸

There is little likelihood that Shakespeare and Lodge coincidentally stumbled onto this metaphor.

For the business of the younger brother rescuing the elder from the lion Shakespeare is indebted to Lodge. In the romance Saladyne is described as falling into a deep sleep in the forest.

As thus he lay, a hungrie Lion came hunting down the edge
of the grove for pray, and espying Saladyne began to cease
upon him: but seeing he lay still without anie motion, he
left to touch him, for that Lions hate to pray on dead
carkasses: and yet desirous to have some food, the Lion
lay downe and watcht to see if he would stirre.¹⁹

In the play Oliver, the sleeping brother, reports what he could not have seen to Celia, and his description of the lion provides yet another link between the romance and the play:

A Lyonnesse, with udders all drawne drie,
Lay cowching head on ground, with catlike watch
When that the sleeping man should stirre; for 'tis
The royall disposition of that beast
To prey on nothing, that doth seeme as dead.²⁰

The changes in the wording of these two passages can be accounted for by the differing demands of drama and of prose.

However, there are other parallel passages which exhibit transformations not so easily explained. Some of these are relatively insignificant. In the romance, for example, Ganimede tells Montanus that "in courting Phoebe thou barkest with the wolves of Syria against the Moone."²¹ In the play Rosalind begs that the declaration of the lovers cease; their complaints are "like the howling of Irish Wolves against the Moone."²² Malone notes the

resemblance of these lines to the source, and Caldecott discerns the difference, saying: "In the passage to which Malone refers it imports an aim at impossibilities, a sense which, whatever may be Rosalind's meaning, cannot very well be attached to it here."²³

Furness concurs with Caldecott: "It is a far cry, or rather, a far 'bark' from Syria to Ireland, and, as Caldecott says, the two phrases are dissimilar in meaning."²⁴ While one reason for this change might have been Shakespeare's attempt to eliminate an exotic simile by substituting a more familiar one, the change in meaning demonstrates that he was also exercising a kind of creative imitation, inventing, in the rhetorical sense of that word, a simile required by his scene.

A similar example of this kind of imitation can be seen in another parallel. In the novel *Ganimede* begins an interview with a melancholy lovesick Rosader by questioning him about the reason for his crestfallen appearance. She mockingly consoles him by pretending that she believes his depression is caused by his failure to track down a deer he has wounded. His, she says, is a small loss, being "but the skinne, the shoulder, and the horne: tis hunters lucke, to ayme faire and misse: and a woodmans fortune to strike and yet goe without the game."²⁵ As Malone notes, this line seems to have suggested the song that forms the principal part of the second scene in the fourth act of the play. The song begins

What shall he have that kild the Deare?
His Leather skin, and hornes to weare.²⁶

In the romance the tone of the words which inspired the song was light and flirtatious; in the play Jaques and Duke Senior's

foresters bawdily capitalize on the ever-popular horn joke. The song's concluding lines are:

Take thou no scorne to weare the horne,
It was a crest ere thou wast borne,
Thy fathers father wore it,
And thy father bore it,
The horne, the horne, the lusty horne,
Is not a thing to laugh to scorne.²⁷

Thus, there is a strong contrast to the delicacy of feeling expressed by the lines in the romance which inspired the song.

Yet another curious shift in emphasis takes place in Shakespeare's use of his source material. Rosader, in the romance, is described as approaching Ganimede and Aliena "with his forest bill on his necke."²⁸ A forest bill, of course, was a sword-like weapon, and Shakespeare, early in the play, seems to allude to his source when the courtier, LeBeu, reports to Celia and Rosalind about the wrestling match in which three brothers are badly hurt.

LeBeu. There comes an old man, and his three sons.

Cel. I could match this beginning with an old tale.

LeBeu. Three proper yong men, of excellent growth and presence.

Ros. With bils on their neckes: Be it knowne unto all men by these presents.²⁹

The allusion to Rosalynde made by the pun on "bils" is clear, as is an apparent allusion to the source of the romance itself, the "old tale."

Furthermore, the scene functions dramatically by mitigating the effect of the reminder of the fate of those who wrestled the evil ruler's champion in the romance. Rosalynde describes the event thus:

At last a lustie Francklin of the Countrie came with two tall men that were his Sonnes. . . . The eldest . . . entered the lyst, and presented himselfe to the Norman, who straight

coapt with him, and as a man that would triumph in the glorie of his strength, roused himselfe with such furie, that not onely hee gave him the fall, but killed him with the weight of his corpulent personage: which the younger brother seeing, leapt presently into the place, and . . . assayed the Norman. . . . The Norman . . . stept so steernely to the young Francklin, that taking him up in his armes he threw him against the ground so violently, that he broake his neck, and so ended his dayes with his brother. At this unlookt for massacre, the people murmured, and were all in a deepe passion of pittie; but the Francklin, Father unto these, never changed his countenance, but as a mā of a couragious resolution, tooke up the bodies of his Sonnes without any shew of outward discontent.³⁰

In part, the incident in the romance is a miniature moral fable demonstrating the way in which one should react to the honorable death of those one loves. As is always the case, the tone of this didactic passage is deadly serious.

In the play, however, the tone is exactly the opposite. Father and sons, and it might be noted in passing that Lodge mentions two brothers while Shakespeare mentions three, do not appear on stage.³¹ Rather, we have the report of their defeat from LeBeu, a stock comic character, who is subjected to the witty word play of Rosalind and Celia. Because of the overly sentimental scene he paints, neither the girls nor the audience is much moved by his report:

LeBeu. The eldest of the three, wrestled with Charles the Dukes Wrastler, which Charles in a moment threw him, and broke three of his ribbes, that there is little hope of life in him: So he serv'd the second, and so the third: yonder they lie, the poore old man their Father, making such pittiful dole over them, that all the beholders take his part with weeping.³²

Rosalind's response to LeBeu's sad tale is a single "Alas." Immediately afterward, the word play begins anew, for it is obvious from the tone of LeBeu's report and the girls' attitude that the three

young men who tried Charles can hardly be near death although they have assuredly been sorely injured. For the defeated wrestlers, as for everyone else in the play, death is only a possibility. No character dies on stage in the play, and the only dead person alluded to is the father of Orlando and Oliver. Even Charles, when overcome by Orlando, is not described as dead. Shakespeare begins the action of the play after the death of Sir John of Bordeaux and refuses to follow his source in the slaughter which took place upon the return of Rosader to his home and the warfare resulting in the death of the usurping duke at the end of the romance. As Shakespeare was well aware, he was writing comedy; death is seldom comic.

The parallels discovered by earlier editors and critics of As You Like It demonstrate rather conclusively that Shakespeare did use Lodge's romance as the major source of his play. Just as conclusive is the demonstration that Shakespeare was involved in something more than merely dramatizing Rosalynde. Instructive of the complexities of creative imitative composition are those passages in which wording, tone, or meaning are changed to suit the purposes of the playwright. There is, furthermore, the suggestion that once an author embarked upon an imitation he could not entirely free himself from his source even when there was little, if any, similarity between the immediate concerns of his work and the source which inspired it. To put it another way, the source apparently comes in through the back door at times. But, important and revealing as they are, the instances of echoing passages are relatively few in number. A look at the respective imageries of the romance and the play will reveal further significant differences.

The history of Rosalynde throws light on the function of its imagery. Like Brooke's Romeus and Juliet, Lodge's romance was popular. Published first in 1590, it underwent ten editions, the last appearing in 1642, the year the theaters were closed and seventeen years after its author's death. This half-century-long popularity is not hard to understand, for Rosalynde tells an interesting story, if a borrowed one, a story that is even today capable of holding the reader's attention. But the waning popularity of its style and the inevitable comparison with the play it inspired have insured its being read only as an exemplar of the first or the source of the second.

Since Lodge was writing a euphuistic novel, his primary interest was in the imitation of a demanding form; thus, the story he chose to showcase his mastery of the euphuistic idiom must not have mattered much to him. It is clear that he employed the Middle English Tale of Gamelyn to provide some of the details of his plot, for the similarities between the two are, in the opinion of those who have closely compared them, too striking to be accidental. Greg even theorized that Lodge had to have had access to a manuscript copy of the Middle English poem.³³ Whatever the case, Lodge added the characters of the two young girls who flee to the forest, their fathers, and the pastoral lovers, as well as the plot complications involving these characters, just as Shakespeare would later add Jaques and Touchstone when he imitated the romance.³⁴

But the exigencies of the euphuistic romance were Lodge's chief concern, and these included, in addition to stylistics, "a heaping up of similes, illustrations, and examples, especially

those drawn from mythology and 'unnatural natural history' about the fabulous habits and qualities of animals and plants."³⁵ Considering the mandates of the genre, only the rarest of geniuses could have satisfied them and at the same time managed to create a work with its own integral imagery. Lodge's genius was apparently not of that quality, and he allowed euphuism to dictate the imagery of his romance.

Not everyone could write a euphuistic novel, for euphuism demanded of its authors a massive invention of simile, metaphor, and example drawn largely from an extensive and sometimes recondite store of information. Lodge, exposed to an excellent education at the Merchant Taylor's School and Oxford, was remarkably well equipped for the task, and an examination of the romance shows him better able to draw more extensively upon some areas of information than others.

Because of his education, his knowledge of classical literature was exemplary; so it is no surprise to see him turning again and again to that body of knowledge for his imagery. For instance, when describing Rosader's reaction to a necklace given him by Rosalynde, Lodge writes, "The Prize that Venus gave to Paris was not halfe so pleasing to the Trojan as this Jemme was to Rosader."³⁶ At the very moment she is being proposed to, Alinda utters a classical allusion: "Mens tongues are like Mercuries pipe, that can inchaunt Argus with an hundred eies; and their words as prejudiciall as the charmes of Circes, that transsfourme men into monsters. If such Syrens sing, wee poore Women had neede stoppe our eares."³⁷ Many of the names given characters evoke the classical world, such as Phoebe and Montanus and Ganimede, the name given to the disguised Rosalynde. It is Ganimede who attempts to dissuade Montanus from

further pursuit of Phoebe. Montanus has delivered to Ganymede a love letter from Phoebe, and Ganymede tells him: "She maketh thee as Bellephoron carrie thine owne bane."³⁸ The shepherd himself, however, turns to the classics to justify his act:

Hee that was wounded with Achilles lance be cured but with the same trunchion: so Apollo was faine to crie out, that Love was onely eased with Love, and fancie healed by no medecin but favor. Phoebus had hearbs to heale all hurts but this passion, Cyrces had charmes for all chaunces but for affection, and Mercurie subtile reasons to refell all griefes but Love.³⁹

And it is Phoebe who is described as "lovely as Venus in her nightgeere, tainting her face with as ruddie a blush as Clitia did when shee bewrayed her Loves to Phoebus."⁴⁰

Not only does Lodge make classical allusions to his characters, but also he draws upon his knowledge of the classics to set scenes. When Rosalynde and Alinda first come upon the valley where they are to settle temporarily, the fertile ground is described as "diapred with Floras riches, as if she ment to wrap Tellus in the glorie of her vestments."⁴¹ It is a place so hidden by trees "that Phoebus could not prie into the secret of that Arbour," a place where "Venus might . . . have dallied unseene with her deerest paramour."⁴² Nearby is a fountain "so Christalline and cleere, that it seemed Diana with her Driades and Hemadriades" used it as their secret bathing place.⁴³ It is unfortunate that Lodge had so little opportunity for such descriptions in his romance; he possessed a considerable talent for this type of landscape painting.

Rich as the imagery drawn from classical sources is, it seems almost restrained when compared to the imagery drawn from the world of real and fabulous nature. Lodge seems to have had an

extensive knowledge of botany, and he begins to display that knowledge early in the book. Old John of Bordeaux, in a long, artificial, and distracting deathbed scene, counsels his sons about choosing friends. They are not to pay too much attention to the outward appearance of a man:

The outward shew makes not the inward man, nor are the dimples in the face the Calenders of trueth. When the Liquorice leafe looketh most drie, then it is most wet. . . . The Baaran leafe the more faire it lookes, the more infectious it is, and in the sweetest words is oft hid the most trecherie.⁴⁴

While it is likely that Lodge's audience had some familiarity with the licorice plant, the Baaran leaf was surely exotic to them. Certainly, then, to have Sir John utter such obscure botanical knowledge would be to destroy the verisimilitude of the character. Lodge, however, was writing in a genre which willingly sacrificed all such considerations of petty realism to the demands of artificial ornament. Thus, John of Bordeaux could continue his deathbed lecture at ridiculous length, following with approximately two hundred words his remark that: "My breath waxeth short and mine eyes dimme, the houre is come and I must away: therefore let this suffice."⁴⁵ In the words which follow, Sir John advises on the choice of a woman; among other qualifications, she should have a tongue like "a Sethin leafe, that never waggas but with a Southeast winde."⁴⁶ And again the reader is asked to believe in Sir John's knowledge of exotic plants.

After such a beginning it is hardly surprising to find a number of other allusions to obscure and perhaps nonexistent plants. For example, "the variable disposition of fancie," mingling the bitter with the sweet, is "like to the Sinople tree, whose blossomes

delight the smell, and whose fruite infects the tast."⁴⁷ And again, Ganimede can say to the languishing Phoebe, "Love growes not like the hearb Spattanna to his perfection in one night."⁴⁸

But, as has been suggested, Lodge does not neglect more common botanical lore. A well-known poisonous plant, *Aconitum*, is referred to at least twice. When he asks Rosader about Rosalynde, Ganimede says, "Happely she resembleth the rose, that is sweete but full of prickles? or the serpent Regius that hath scales as glorious as the Sunne, & a breath as infectious as the Aconitum is deadly?"⁴⁹ Another reference to the plant occurs when Montanus, the shepherd, describes the significance of the costume he wears to the wedding of Saladyne and Aliena:

I am sir . . . Loves Swaine, as full of inward discontents as I seeme fraught with outward follies. Mine eyes like Bees delight in sweete flowers, but sucking their full on the faire of beautie, they carrie home to the Hive of my heart farre more gall than honnie, and for one droppe of pure deaw, a tunne full of deadly Aconiton.⁵⁰

Lodge's audience was familiar with the flower known as *Aconitum* or Wolf's-bane or Monk's-hood, and its presence in England had been noted as early as the tenth century.⁵¹ The common knowledge of *Aconitum*'s properties would have served to strengthen the reader's appreciation of Ganimede's question about Rosalynde and the woeful plight of Montanus.

Other examples of Lodge's use of the everyday knowledge of plant life are easy enough to find. Rosader compares his Rosalynde to classical paragons of beauty, and these latter suffer from the comparison: "If Phillis had been as beauteous, or Ariadne as vertuous, or both as honourable and excellent as she; neither had the Philbert

tree sorrowed in the death of despairing Phillis, nor the starres have been graced with Ariadne."⁵² The cedar tree's height is alluded to by Rosalynde when, bemoaning her present fortunes, she observes that the greatest evils seem to plague those placed in high station: "The greatest seas have the sorest stormes, the highest birth subject to the most bale, and of al trees the Cedars soonest shake with the winde."⁵³ These and the other botanical allusions in the play were called for by the requirement that a euphuistic novel reflect the nature of the world.

By the same token, there is an extensive range of zoological imagery in Rosalynde, much wider than the botanical imagery. Once again there are many allusions to life forms never seen in England. To describe the treacherous nature of Saladyne, Lodge draws upon a menagerie of exotic animals. Saladyne grieves at the death of his father, and Lodge comments:

but as the Hiena when she mournes is then most guilefull,
so Saladine under this shew of griefe shadowed a heart full
of contented thoughtes: the Tyger though hee hide his clawes,
will at last discover his rapine: the Lions lookes are not
the mappes of his meaning, nor a mans phisnomie is not the
display of his secrets.⁵⁴

Another member of the cat family foreign to England provides another figure of speech: The eyes of women "dallie in the delight of faire objects, til gazing on the Panthers beautifull skinne, repenting experience tell them hee hath a devouring paunch."⁵⁵

Still stranger animals are alluded to, such as the aforementioned "serpent Regius that hath scales as glorious as the Sunne."⁵⁶ Or the polypus, or octopus, whose reputed ability to change color provides Lodge twice with an image. The first instance occurs when

Sir John warns his sons about the wiles of women, whose "passions are as momentarie as the colours of a Polipe, which changeth at the sight of everie object."⁵⁷ The second involves Saladyne's report of Rosader's reactions when thinking of Rosalynde: It is "as if in one person love had lodged a Chaos of confused passions. Wherein I have noted the variable disposition of fancie, that like the Polype in colours, so it changeth into sundrie humours."⁵⁸

The insect world also provides its share of images in the romance. For example, Ganimede teases Rosader about the quality of his love: "flies have their spleene, the ants choller, the least haire shadowes, & the smallest loves great desires."⁵⁹ And, in professing his love for Aliena, Saladyne says that, before he met her, "I liked al because I loved none, and who was most faire on her I fed mine eye: but as charely as the Bee, that assoone as she hath suckt honnie from the rose, flies straight to the next Marigold."⁶⁰ Aliena, in turn, teases her suitor, whose love she claims to doubt: "Men in their fancie resemble the waspe, which scornes that flower from which she hath fetcht her waxe."⁶¹ Note that these two utilize what is essentially the same metaphor, differing only in that the fickle insect is a bee in one instance and a wasp in the other. Either the reader is to infer that Aliena does not listen to what Saladyne says or that Lodge paid little attention to what he wrote, especially in view of the close proximity of the two passages.

Certain of the insect images probably derive from folklore, both English and foreign. An Italian folk cure for those bitten by the tarantula spider is alluded to by Lodge when he makes Montanus,

supposedly a simple shepherd, lament his love for Phoebe: "The wisest counsellors are my deep discontents, and I hate that which should salve my harm, like the patient which stung with the Tarantula loaths musick, and yet the disease incurable but by melody."⁶²

Montanus has earlier cited another such folk cure when, in reply to Ganimede's urging that he abandon the fickle Phoebe, he says, "I tell thee, Ganimede . . . as they which are stung by the Scorpion, cannot be recovered but by the Scorpion . . . so Apollo was faine to cry out that Love was onely eased with Love."⁶³ Perhaps not folklore, but clearly proverbial, is the advice given to his sons by Sir John of Bordeaux:

Learne of the Ant in sommer to provide;
Drive with the Bee the Droane from out thy hive.⁶⁴

These precepts were not new.

It is Sir John who also introduces the first instances of bird imagery in the romance. He is central to several examples, beginning with his reference to himself as one whose "plumes are full of sicke feathers touched with age."⁶⁵ Lodge, combining myth with birdlore, also describes Sir John as one "that with the Phenix knewe the tearme of his life was now expyred, and could with the Swanne discover his end by her songs."⁶⁶ In his advice to his sons the old man also alludes to birds; he tells Saladyne and Rosader to

Ayme your deedes by my honorable endeavours, and shewe your selves siens worthie of so florishing a tree: least as the birds Halcyones which exceede in whitenesse, I hatch yong ones that surpasse in blacknesse. . . Soare not with the Hobbie, least you fall with the Larke.⁶⁷

Emma Phipson explains the latter allusion: The hobby, a small falcon, was sometimes "employed in taking larks alive, by the method called

daring them. If the hobby were thrown up in a field, the larks rose and thus betrayed their nests."⁶⁸ Sir John also advises his sons to "builde like the Swallowe in the sommer tide."⁶⁹ He is, of course, alluding to the seasonal industry of these birds, as did Drayton when he referred to their habit of feeding while in flight.⁷⁰

Lodge's knowledge of birds seems to be largely based on his acquaintance with falconry, for the majority of his allusions to birds are drawn from that context. In addition to Sir John's reference to the hobby, there are two other allusions to it. To Montanus, Ganymede says, "Thou seekest with Phoebus to winne Daphne, and shee flies faster than thou canst followe: thy desires soare with the Hobbie, but her disdaine reacheth higher than thou canst make wing."⁷¹ But perhaps the most revealing reference is that in the dedication of the romance, for it affords a most plausible reason for his knowledge of the habits of that small falcon. There, he puns on the name of Sir Edward Hoby, to whom he was a servitor at Oxford.⁷² The son of the translator of the Courtier is described as "a mā as well lettered as well borne, and after the Etymologie of his name, soaring as high as the wings of knowledge can mount him."⁷³ Other allusions to falconry include the metaphor employed to describe Rosalynde's reaction to Rosader (she "flew to the fist without anie call")⁷⁴ and Aliena's question testing Saladyne's willingness to marry beneath his social station ("Will the Fawlcyn perch with the Kistresse?").⁷⁵ With a few exceptions, such as the halcyon and possibly the phoenix, the bird imagery in the romance would require no special effort on the part of its readers to understand; on the other hand, neither would they learn much that was new.

Rosalynde was written during a long cruise to the New World, but was apparently not read very closely by Lodge before he submitted it to the printer. There are numerous instances in the romance of near repetition. One, that involving the flitting of an insect from flower to flower, has already been noted. Another has Rosader telling his faithful servant, "Thou are olde Adam, and thy haire wax white, the Palme tree is alreadie full of bloomes."⁷⁶ This metaphor repeats the one used by Rosader's father, who described himself as "the Palme tree [that] waxeth away ward."⁷⁷ That Lodge should not have exercised more care in the discovery of fresh images in these and other instances suggests that he was, ultimately, not very painstaking in his use of figurative language.

Such an obvious unconcern for redundancy might be seen as evidence that Lodge was a sloppy craftsman. However, also possible is the hypothesis that any concern for the imagery of his work was expended on language appropriate to the genre he was attempting. In other words, form rather than content was his goal. And, in the case of the genre, the accomplishment of the form was art enough.

From the discussion of the imagery of Rosalynde one fact is clear. Although several areas of imagery can be discerned, the romance does not have a dominant imagery that adds meaning to the work, and in this respect differs completely from Arthur Brooke's Romeus and Juliet. Had Shakespeare been tempted, he might have chosen to imitate the dominant imagery of Brooke; insofar as Rosalynde is concerned, he could not have been tempted. We now turn to a consideration of Shakespeare's imagery in his imitation of Lodge.

Professor Spurgeon's analysis of the imagery of As You Like It is well worth reviewing. She sees three broad categories: wit, topical allusion, and nature.⁷⁸ Of the characters, she singles out Rosalind, Celia, and Touchstone as three whose wit sparkles throughout the play. Jaques is included among the wits for his seven ages of man speech, and Touchstone is seen as "reminding us at times of Lyly, by his delight in the mere sound of a succession of comparisons."⁷⁹ As evidence she offers Touchstone's reply to a question about his intentions concerning marriage:

As the Oxe hath his bow sir, the horse his curb, and the Falcon her bells, so man hath his desires, and as Pigeons bill, so wedlocke would be nibbling.⁸⁰

When the source of the play is considered, passages such as this should remind the reader more of Lodge than of Lyly.

Of the topical allusions, the first discussed is of more than passing interest, for Professor Spurgeon claims one of Touchstone's speeches concerns the death of Marlowe. Touchstone's words are:

When a mans verses cannot be understood, nor a mans good wit seconded with the forward childe, understanding: it strikes a man more dead then a great reckoning in a little roome.⁸¹

These lines, she says, allude "to the death of Marlowe by Ingram Frysar's dagger in the so-called quarrel over 'le recknyng' in Eleanor Bull's house at Deptford."⁸² Her reasoning is that the lines refer "first to the facts of Marlowe's death, and secondly to his well-known line, 'Infinite riches in a little room.'"⁸³

This twofold allusion "makes the meaning of the reference a certainty."⁸⁴ Interesting as her conjecture is, it is by no means certain.

Of greater interest are the nature images in the play. Of all the comedies, Professor Spurgeon says, As You Like It has the largest number of animal and nature images.⁸⁵ They function, she asserts, in no specific way, contributing instead to the play's general atmosphere. This impression is not created by direct description, since there are only two passages devoted to the description of the settings, but depends instead on the cumulative effect of a large number of details.

There are . . . continual touches which keep ever before the audience the background of nature, such as the opening scene in the orchard, the duke's references to winter's wind and trees and running brooks, the stag hunt, the shepherd's cot, Amiens' song, Orlando's verses, the meal under the shade of melancholy boughs, Corin's shepherd's talk, the foresters and their song, and the exquisite "foolish song" at the end, to which Touchstone counted it but time lost to listen.⁸⁶

In creating these images, she points out, Shakespeare makes full use of simile and metaphor. Examples are

the picture of walking through a thorny wood, . . . the girl's jests about briars and burs; the charming little glimpse, given by Silvius in his modesty, of gleaning the broken ears in the harvest field; or even so tiny a touch as Celia's description of finding Orlando "under a tree, like a dropped acorn."⁸⁷

Shakespeare's fondness for garden and orchard is demonstrated by

the many similes from grafting, pruning and weeding, as in Rosalind's chaff with Touchstone about "grafting" with the medlar, Orlando's warning to Adam that in staying with him he prunes "a rotten tree," Touchstone's metaphor of fruit ripening and rotting, [and] . . . Jaques' suggestion that the duke should weed his "better judgment of all opinion that grows rank in them."⁸⁸

As examples of the "unusual number of animal similes," she cites

the doe going to find her fawn to give it food, the weasel sucking eggs, chanticler crowing, the wild goose flying, pigeons feeding, and such vivid glimpses of animal passion and emotion as those given us by Rosalind, "there was never

anything so sudden but the fight of two rams," "I will be more jealous of thee than a Barbary cock-pigeon over his hen."⁸⁹

Although images such as those she cites operate to help create the prevailing atmosphere of the play, she admits the difficulty of assessing the effect.

It would be hard to say how strongly and yet how subtly our feeling of being out of doors, of wind and weather, is increased or reinforced by such remarks as Adam's comparison of his age to

a lusty winter,
Frosty, but kindly;

Jaques' demand for

as large a charter as the wind,
To blow on whom I please;

Hymen's doggerel chant,

You and you are sure together,
As the winter to foul weather;

Rosalind's taunt to Silvius foolishly following Phoebe,

Like foggy south, puffing with wind and rain,
or her gay defiance to Orlando, "men are April when they woo,
December when they wed: maids are May when they are maids,
but the sky changes when they are wives."⁹⁰

Certainly, the nature imagery to which she points functions very much in the way she has described it, and just as certain is her evaluation of the difficulty of coming to any conclusions about its effectiveness. Any evaluation of that sort must be subjective. Two possibilities do evolve from her examination of the nature imagery, however. The first is that in the quantity of such imagery Shakespeare may very well have been imitating his source; the second is that the quality of the imagery suggests that Lodge and Shakespeare were concerned with portraying quite different worlds.

There is one very considerable body of imagery that is completely neglected by Professor Spurgeon, and this is the imagery

which refers to wealth and its getting, disbursing, and counting. Indeed, so important is this imagery that it might be said to dominate the play. Certainly, it adds meaning.

The opening lines of the play commence the parade of this imagery of wealth. Orlando says,

As I remember Adam, it was upon this fashion bequeathed me by will, but poore a thousand Crownes, and as thou saist, charged my brother on his blessing to breed mee well: and there begins my sadnesse: My brother Jaques he keepes at schoole, and report speakes goldenly of his profit.⁹¹

There are a number of direct and indirect references to wealth in these lines. Orlando speaks of the inheritance "bequeathed" him amounting to "but poore a thousand Crownes," and the news of Jaques "speakes goldenly of his profit."

There are, in addition, a host of allusions to wealth made by many of the other characters. Charles, the wrestler, having been falsely warned about Orlando, declares he will give the younger brother "his payment,"⁹² and near the end of Act IV, Oliver and Rosalind, disguised as Ganimed, manage to utter some form of the word "counterfeit" six times in seventeen lines.⁹³

The melancholy Jaques frequently resorts to the language of wealth in the play. In arguing that none are free of the sin of pride, Jaques characterizes all London women as clothes-horses.

What woman in the Citie do I name,
When that I say the City woman beares
The cost of Princes on unworthy shoulders?
Who can come in, and say that I meane her,
When such a one as shee, such is her neighbor?⁹⁴

A second allusion occurs at the beginning of Scene 5, Act II, when Amyens sings a verse of the song which is emblematic of the Forest

of Arden, "Under the greene wood tree," and Jaques begs for more, a request which results in the following dialogue.

Come, more, another stanza: Cal you 'em stanzos?

Amy. What you wil Monsieur Jaques.

Jaq. Nay, I care not for their names, they owe mee nothing. Wil you sing [?]

Amy. More at your request, then to please my selfe.

Jaq. Well then, if ever I thanke any man, Ile thanke you: but that they cal complement is like th encounter of two dog-Apes. And when a man thankes me hartily, me thinkes I have given him a penie, and he renders me the beggerly thankes.⁹⁵

Jaques' last allusion to money, though churlish, is clear enough:

too obsequious gratitude is no gratitude at all. But, as the

Variorum explains, a more obscure allusion is hidden in the idea of

"names" which "owe" nothing to Jaques. The word is

used in a classical, legal sense. Caldecott finds the allusion to the Latin phrase, nomina facere, which we all know means to "set down, or book the items of debt in the account book," as the definition reads in Andrew's Lexicon. But it seems to me that it is simpler to suppose that Jaques refers merely, as he says, to "the names," for which the Latin is plain nomina. In Cooper's Thesaurus, 1573, the Dictionary which Shakespeare probably used (we are told that Queen Elizabeth used it), the second definition of nomina is "the names of debtes owen." Here it is possible, that Shakespeare may have found the allusion which Jaques makes.⁹⁶

Thus, there are two similar explanations of the line, both of which pertain to money.

Two other similar allusions made by Jaques appear in the following lines. Jaques tells Duke Senior that a person must laugh at himself when a fool's jest strikes home; otherwise

The Wise-mans folly is anathomiz'd
Even by the squandring glances of the foole.
Invest me in my motley: Give me leave
To speake my minde, and I will through and through
Cleanse the foule bodie of th'infected world.
If they will patiently receive my medicine.

Du. Sen. Fie on thee. I can tell what thou wouldst do.

Jag. What, for a Counter, would I do, but good?⁹⁷

In these lines the word "squandring" in Jaques' first speech suggests that the fool's license to point out man's folly is a waste, a "squandring"; if he, Jaques, were granted the same privilege, he would not waste it in idle jesting. The less obvious reference involves the word "counter," a substitute coin used to facilitate difficult financial calculations. Steevens notes that "about the time when this play was written the French 'counters' were brought into use in England," and Knight identifies them as being "small and very thin . . . generally copper or brass, but occasionally of silver, or even gold; they were commonly used for purposes of calculation in abbeys and other places, where the revenues were complex and of difficult adjustment."⁹⁸ In other words, if the difficult calculations as to his effect on the world could be made, Jaques concludes the ultimate result could only be favorable.

Rosalind also indulges in allusions to wealth. When Jaques claims his "most humorous sadness" is somehow the result of his travels, Rosalind chides him:

A Traveller: by my faith you have great reason to be sad:
I feare you have sold your owne Lands, to see other mens;
then to have seene much, and to have nothing, is to have
rich eyes and poore hands.⁹⁹

In short, Jaques is a fool. Such imagery is also used when, in the disguise of Ganimed, she answers Orlando's question about the "principall evils" an imaginary "religious Unckle" accused women of having: "There were none principal, they were all like one another, as halfe-pence are."¹⁰⁰ Wright's note affords an interesting commentary which reveals that the simile suggests terminal dates for the play.

No halfpence were coined in Elizabeth's reign till 1582-3. Bacon refers to "the late new halfpence" in the Dedication to the first edition of his Essays, which was published in 1597.¹ They all had the portcullis with a mint mark, and on the reverse a cross moline with three pellets in each angle, so that, in comparison with the great variety of coins of other denominations then in circulation, there was a propriety in saying "as like one another as halfpence are." They were used till 1601.¹⁰¹

One of Touchstone's quibbles may be similarly explicated.

Upon their arrival in the Forest of Arden, the runaways are exhausted and Celia says, "I pray you beare with me, I cannot goe no further." Touchstone answers,

For my part, I had rather beare with you, then beare you:
yet I should beare no crosse if I did beare you, for I
thinke you have no money in your purse.¹⁰²

Dyce's note illuminates: "The ancient penny, according to Stow, had a double cross with a crest stamped on it, so that it might be easily broken in the midst, or in four quarters. Hence it became a common phrase when a person had no money about him, to say, he had not a single cross."¹⁰³ As Wright's note in the preceding paragraph indicates, the halfpence also was distinguished by a cross, as were some of the counters.

Finally, in considering the pervasiveness of the wealth imagery throughout As You Like It, the significance of Touchstone's name should not be overlooked. The function of a touchstone, of course, was to test the purity of gold or silver. Certainly, in the play Touchstone functions to help separate the real from the counterfeit.

While much of the wealth imagery in the play seems at first glance to have no function apart from adding meaning to the scenes in which it occurs, a closer look will reveal that this imagery

results from the play's major concerns and, through interpretation, points toward these concerns. Whatever else the play may do, it gives serious consideration to the problems of value and justice.

From the very first, wealth is used to objectify the injustices examined by the play. The initiating action of the play involves the unfair treatment of Orlando by his brother Oliver, who is motivated by greed. The magnitude of this greed is understood through the imagery of wealth. The situation between the two brothers is manifested by such language. Orlando, for example, complains that Oliver's horses receive better care than he; riders are "deerely hir'd" to teach them. Orlando does not "gaine" anything from his brother; it is "nothing that he so plentifully gives me." When Oliver first appears, Orlando asks him "what prodigall portion have I spent, that I should come to such penury?"¹⁰⁴ He reminds Oliver that he, the eldest brother, is responsible for his education, and, since Oliver is not undertaking his responsibility, demands to be given "the poore allotery my father left me," so that he can "goe buy my fortunes." With contempt, Oliver responds, "And what will thou do? beg when that is spent?"¹⁰⁵ Before the scene ends, the wrestler enters, and Oliver's plot to have his younger brother killed rather than relinquish to him his rightful inheritance is revealed.

* Others besides Orlando help to characterize Oliver. Adam, the faithful old family servant, is cursed by Oliver, whereupon Adam muses, "Is olde dogge my reward."¹⁰⁶ Again, language relating to wealth is used. Thus is the enormity of Oliver's injustice revealed.

The relationship of Duke Senior and Duke Fredericke parallels that of Orlando and Oliver, and, as might be expected, the language of wealth helps to provide an understanding of the injustice. Rosalind and Celia, respectively the daughters of Duke Senior and Duke Fredericke, inform us about the villainy of the usurper. Unlike their fathers, the girls are the best of friends, and Rosalind declares to Celia that she "will forget the condition of my estate to rejoyce in yours."¹⁰⁷ Celia, in turn, promises that, upon the death of her father, Rosalind "shalt be his heire."¹⁰⁸ While Rosalind's comment is noble, Celia's openly admits that the "condition" of her estate has been gained unjustly and generously offers to set things right when she can.

Duke Fredericke himself arrives on the scene and banishes Rosalind on the grounds that she is a traitor, whereupon both the girls plead with him. Rosalind, anxious to clear her reputation, tells her uncle that "treason is not inherited"¹⁰⁹ and asks that he not "thinke my povertie is treacherous."¹¹⁰ Celia begs her father to allow Rosalind to remain in the court, reminding him that it was he who originally permitted Rosalind to stay as her companion. Then, Celia remembers, "I was too yong that time to value her."¹¹¹ Duke Fredericke, however, has become even more confirmed in his villainy and tells his daughter that she is a fool; Rosalind, he says, "robs thee of thy name."¹¹² The irony of this statement is obvious, for he it is who unjustly usurped the throne. Unable to convince her father and, presumably, unwilling to be an accessory to this final inequity, Celia decides to run away with Rosalind.

This scene, and the language of wealth used in it, demonstrate the injustice from which Rosalind, Celia, and Orlando flee.

At least once in the play every one of the women who are to be married in the last act is described in language which relates to money or wealth. Orlando, in one of the sonnets with which he has decorated Arden's trees, compares his love to a jewel:

From the east to western Inde,
no jewel is like Rosalinde,
Hir worth being mounted on the winde,
through all the world beares Rosalinde.¹¹³

And, when Oliver first comes upon Celia and Rosalind, he says to them

If that an eye may profit by a tongue,
Then should I know you by description.¹¹⁴

Touchstone also resorts to the imagery of jewels in describing Audrey to Duke Senior. He calls her

a poore virgin sir, an il favor'd thing sir, but mine owne,
a poore humour of mine sir, to take that that no man else
will: rich honestie dwels like a miser sir, in a poore
house, as your Pearle in your foule oyster.¹¹⁵

Celia's worth is similarly announced to her father by the serving woman who had seen her to bed the previous night. Duke Fredericke inquires about his daughter and is told that Celia's attendants had "found the bed untreasur'd of their Mistris."¹¹⁶

The imagery is used to insult as well as compliment.

Rosalind deals with the fickle Phebe:

I see no more in you then in the ordinary
Of Natures sale-worke.¹¹⁷

As Wright notes, "the modern phrase is 'ready-made goods.'"¹¹⁸

Cruelly, Rosalind advises the shepherdess to accept Silvius' love:

For I must tell you friendly in your eare,
 Sell when you can, you are not for all markets.¹¹⁹

Rosalind's insults, of course, have a purpose. Her true attitudes toward her sex were expressed earlier. After she and Celia decide to run away, Rosalind, fearful for their safety, says, not immodestly, "Beautie provoketh theeves sooner then gold."¹²⁰

The lighthearted approach to love, exemplified by Rosalind's remarks to Phebe and Touchstone's about Audrey, is continued through imagery referring to wealth. Touchstone, for example, comments on what is to be expected from marriage:

As horses are odious, they are necessarie. It is said, many a man knowes no end of his goods; right: Many a man has good Hornes, and knows no end of them. Well, that is the dowrie of his wife, 'tis none of his owne getting. . . . Is the single man therefore blessed? No, as a wall'd Towne is more worthier then a village, so is the forehead of a married man, more honourable then the bare brow of a Batcheller: and by how much defence is better then no skill, by so much is a horne more precious then to want.¹²¹

The rewards of marriage, then, are dubious, for one is sure to be a cuckold; yet, as Touchstone says, poor as these rewards are, the dowry is, perhaps, better than nothing.

In jest, Rosalind disguised as Ganimed taunts Orlando. He has tardily arrived to practice his courtship and is told by Rosalind that she would "as lief be woo'd of a Snaille" because "though he comes slowly, hee carries his house on his head; a better joyncture I thinke then you make a woman."¹²² Compounding her imagined scorn for Orlando's economic status, Rosalind continues with her reference to the husband's destiny: a snail comes already equipped with horns, which "such as you are faine to be beholding to your wives for: but he comes armed in his fortune, and prevents the slander of his wife."¹²³

The irony of these words is shared by the audience, for in an earlier scene Celia has tortured Rosalind by keeping her in suspense about seeing the man who has hung love poems addressed to her upon the branches of trees in the forest. About that man Rosalind asked, "Is his head worth a hat? Or his chin worth a beard?"¹²⁴ Yet, upon discovering the poet to be Orlando and confronting him in disguise, she can mock him by telling him that he does not have the marks of a lover, one of which is "a beard neglected, which you have not: (but I pardon you for that, for simply your having in beard, is a younger brothers revennew)." ¹²⁵ Although Rosalind continually teases Orlando about his worthlessness, Celia makes her pay for these taunts by raising doubts about Orlando's love for her. She should not pay too much attention to a lover, for "the oath of Lover is no stronger then the word of a Tapster, they are both the confirmer of false reckonings."¹²⁶ And Celia also torments her friend by pointing out his worth; he is, after all, "not a picke purse, nor a horse-stealer."¹²⁷ Marriage offers horns to men and doubtful jointures to women, and lovers seem always to be worthless.

But, once in love, one can understand love's paradox, and again the value of love is expressed in imagery relating to wealth. Phebe, lovesick for Ganimed, can say to Silvius,

the time was, that I hated thee;
And yet it is not, that I beare thee love,
But since that thou canst talke of love so well,
Thy company, which erst was irkesome to me
I will endure; and Ile employ thee too:
But doe not looke for further recompence
Then thine owne gladnesse, that thou art employed. ¹²⁸

Silvius is, as all ideal lovers must be, content with the crumbs offered him by the one he loves. But is Phebe's offer such a

meager payment for his devotion? No, indeed, for he says

So holy, and so perfect is my love,
And I in such a poverty of grace,
That I shall thinke it a most plenteous crop
To gleane the broken eares after the man
That the maine harvest reapes.¹²⁹

Of course, the primary metaphor in this reply is a religious one, yet the "employ," "employed," and "recompence" in Phebe's speech mesh perfectly with the "poverty" in that of Silvius to suggest that what is of dubious value in the eyes of the beloved can become infinitely precious in the eyes of the lover.

The imagery of wealth functions to make concrete the major problem of the drama, and that is the restoration of justice in the world of the play. The lines spoken by Orlando to Oliver early in Act I, Scene 1, establish the condition which will be resolved. Orlando, in response to Oliver's indignant question as to whether he is aware that he is speaking to his elder brother, replies:

I, better then him I am before knowes mee: I know you are my eldest brother, and in the gentle condition of bloud you should so know me: the courtesie of nations allowes you my better, in that you are the first borne, but the same tradition takes not away my bloud, were there twenty brothers betwixt us: I have as much of my father in mee, as you, albeit I confesse your comming before me is neerer to his reverence.¹³⁰

Although in the eyes of the law, "the courtesie of nations," Oliver is indeed Orlando's better, even law does not deny the existence of the blood relationship which exists between brothers. Oliver, by his unjust neglect of his brother, has deprived Orlando of his legal and natural rights.

Signaling a less than ideal condition of the world is the similar dichotomy distinguished by Rosalind and Celia in their

opening scene. The girls choose to "devise sports" to entertain themselves, and Celia proposes a pastime:

Cel. Let us sit and mocke the good houswife Fortune from her wheele, that her gifts may henceforthe bee bestowed equally.

Ros. I would wee could doe so: for her benefits are mightily misplaced, and the bountifull blinde woman doth most mistake in her gifts to women.

Cel. 'Tis true, for those that she makes faire, she scarce makes honest, & those that she makes honest, she makes very illfavouredly.

Ros. Nay now thou goest from Fortunes office to Natures: Fortune reignes in gifts of the world, not in the lineaments of Nature.¹³¹

Touchstone enters upon the scene at this point, and the girls, after some sophistries by Celia which do not succeed in refuting Rosalind's point about the domains of Fortune and Nature, turn their attention to teasing the clown. Still, they have said enough to make it clear that they, like Orlando, are well aware of the inequities which exist in their world. As Rosalind later says, "Oh how full of briers is this working day world."¹³²

Even the courtier LeBeu acknowledges the imperfection of the world. He takes his leave of Orlando after the wrestling, saying,

Sir, fare you well,
Hereafter in a better world then this, ¹³³
I shall desire more love and knowledge of you.

LeBeu refers to heaven, not knowing that the principals of the play will find a better world on earth.

The defeat of the wrestler Charles shows that the injustices of the world are not entirely irremediable on earth. Although Duke Fredericke refuses to reward Orlando appropriately for his

victory, Rosalind's bestowal of her heart on the young hero, a reward greater than any the duke could offer, is evidence that virtue does not always go unrecompensed. The wrestling scene and its immediate aftermath prefigure the action of the play.

Charles, the wrestler, also introduces another cluster of metaphors which help to bring the imagery of wealth into focus. In the first act he is interviewed by Oliver, whose first question is about the court. Charles informs Oliver, and the audience, about the exile of Duke Senior to the Forest of Arden:

They say hee is already in the Forrest of Arden, and a many merry men with him; and there they live like the old Robin Hood of England: they say many yong Gentlemen flocke to him every day, and fleet the time carelessly as they did in the golden world.¹³⁴

This comparison of the Forest of Arden with "the golden world" is further suggested by other references. The Forest of Arden is not an ordinary place. For example, Oliver's report of Orlando's discovery of him asleep in the forest describes creatures that would not be native to France or England, the snake and the lion:

about his necke
A greene and guilded snake had wreath'd it selfe,
Who with her head, nimble in threats approach'd
The opening of his mouth: but sodainly
Seeing Orlando, it unlink'd it selfe,
And with indented glides, did slip away
Into a bush, under which bushes shade
A Lyonnesse, with udders all drawne drie,
Lay cowching head on ground, with catlike watch.¹³⁵

It is not only that these creatures are alien to the temperate zones which establish the Forest of Arden as being apart from the "real" world; the tone and symbolism of this passage establish the Forest of Arden as the site of miracles, the "golden world" where true worth is recognized and perfect justice is realized.

This idea is implicit in the contrast between Amyens' song and Jaques' version of it. Amyens sings

Under the greene wood tree,
 who loves to lye with mee,
 And turne his merrie Note,
 unto the sweet Birds throte:
 Come hither, come hither, come hither:
 Heere shall he see noemie,
 But Winter and rough Weather.¹³⁶

The world of the forest Amyens sings of is subject only to the inexorable laws of nature. Jaques' version of the same song is

If it do come to passe, that any man turne Asse:
 Leaving his wealth and ease,
 A stubborne will to please,
 Ducdame, ducdame, ducdame:
 Here shall he see, grosse fooles as he,
 And if he will come to me.¹³⁷

Although the sour Jaques seems to be expressing a kind of wisdom, it is the wisdom of the cynic who will take the cash. Jaques' vision of man's fate, given in the oft-repeated and admired set piece, which leaves man "sans everything," robs life of its magic as surely as his parody robs Amyens' song of some of its charm. Yet the play makes it clear that his is not the accepted attitude, for great pains are taken to portray Jaques as a humorous character, a special kind of fool whose personality is out of balance.

It is in the Forest of Arden that things are restored to their natural order. The reconciliation of Orlando and Oliver must necessarily occur some time before the end of the play, but Oliver, through his brother's example, has learned the proper value of human relationships. He has seen that "kindnesse," kinship and its obligations, is "nobler ever then revenge," and that "Nature" is "stronger then . . . just occasion" for remedying wrongs.¹³⁸ This

understanding has led to his "conversion" and his willingness to remain near the forest with Celia as a shepherd, resigning to his brother all that he has legally inherited from, and unjustly acquired of, their father's estate. The formerly greedy Oliver has, in the Forest of Arden, learned about true value.

Similarly, and even more miraculously, Duke Fredericke is made to see the error of his ways. In pursuit of his brother and the "men of great worth" who every day desert to join the rightful duke in the Forest of Arden (and it might be pointed out that the "worth" of these men implies both wealth and character, although they willingly sacrifice the former for the latter), Duke Fredericke journeys to the forest.

And to the skirts of this wilde Wood he came:
Where, meeting with an old Religious man,
After some question with him, was converted
Both from his enterprize, and from the world:
His crowne bequeathing to his banish'd Brother
And all their Lands restor'd to him againe
That were with him exil'd.¹³⁹

Duke Fredericke, like Oliver, is cured of greed in the Forest of Arden.

So it is that Duke Senior can signal the restoration of balance between the gifts of nature, nobility and beauty, and the gifts of fortune, the "gifts of the world." The four couples will be married, declares the duke

And after, every of this happie number
That have endur'd shrew'd daies, and nights with us,
Shal share the good of our returned fortune,
According to the measure of their states.¹⁴⁰

Because of the events which have transpired in the Forest of Arden this promise of a justly meted out reward can be made, and the duke, joyfully punning, commands the gathered company to dance:

Play Musicke, and you Brides and Bride-groomes all,
 With measure heap'd in joy, to'th Measures fall.¹⁴¹

Shakespeare's Forest of Arden, then, contrasted to Lodge's, demonstrates in at least one respect the way in which the playwright was original. The world of Rosalynde, as the world of the euphuistic romances had to be, is wondrous, but ultimately realistic. In portraying the world of the romance, Lodge displayed a considerable knowledge which, no matter how wondrous or fabulous, had reality as its ultimate reference point.

Unlike that of the romance, the external world of the play, however, is portrayed as, with possibly one exception, an ordinary world, but a world wherein perfect justice, the extraordinary, happens. It is the world of comedy, not meant to correspond to the real world where love may not be requited, where brothers frequently remain enemies, and where thrones seldom are restored to their rightful owners. Whatever might be implied by the world of the play, it is the world as you and I would like it.

NOTES

1. The names of characters in Rosalynde and As You Like It are likely to be confusing for a number of reasons. In addition to the usual inconsistency of spelling in the contemporary texts (for example, Audrey in the first folio also appears as Awdrie, Audrie, and Audry), the runaway girls have two names apiece, Shakespeare was inconsistent in adopting the names from the romance, and editors of both texts have elected to spell names as they saw fit. The most interesting example of the latter practice involves the character LeBeu. Upon his first entrance the name is spelled LeBeau in the first folio; thereafter, the name is uniformly spelled LeBeu. Beginning with Pope, editors of the play frequently chose to spell the name LeBeau. Throughout this chapter, I shall use the most common spelling of the name of a character as it appears in the first folio. For the romance, I shall use the character's name as it appears in the Variorum reprint of Rosalynde. To aid the reader in properly identifying characters, I list below the names of the characters in the play in the order of their appearance and the corresponding character in the romance, if any. In every case but one, the name Aliena, either Shakespeare named a parallel character differently or spelled the name differently. Sir Roland de Boys, the counterpart of Sir John of Bordeaux, does not appear in the list, for he does not appear in the play. Brackets around the name of a character in the play indicate that the name came from the text rather than a stage direction.

<u>As You Like It</u>	<u>Rosalynde</u>
Orlando	Rosader
Adam	Adam Spencer
Oliver	Saladyne
Dennis	
Charles (the wrestler)	The Norman
Rosalind - Ganimed	Rosalynde - Ganimede
Celia - Aliena	Alinda - Aliena
Clowne, alias Touchstone	
LeBeu	
Duke [Fredericke]	Torismond
Duke Senior	Gerismond
Amyens	
Jaques	
Corin	Coridon
Audrey	

Sir Oliver Mar-text

Silvius

Montanus

Phebe

Phoebe

William

Hymen

Second Brother (of Orlando
and Oliver)

Fernandyne

[Jaques]

2. William Shakespeare, A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare, Vol. VIII: As You Like It, ed. Horace Howard Furness (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1890), p. 12n. This work is hereafter referred to as Variorum.
3. Ibid., p. 316.
4. Ibid., p. 367.
5. William Shakespeare, Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies, A Facsimile Edition Prepared by Helge Kokeritz (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954), p. 201. This work is hereafter referred to as Facsimile.
6. Variorum, p. 224n.
7. Ibid., p. 345.
8. Ibid., p. 117.
9. Ibid., p. 117n.
10. Ibid., p. 324.
11. Facsimile, p. 185.
12. Variorum, p. 331.
13. Facsimile, p. 189.
14. Ibid.
15. Variorum, p. 366.
16. Facsimile, p. 190.
17. Variorum, p. 333.
18. Facsimile, pp. 201-202.
19. Variorum, p. 358.
20. Facsimile, p. 203.

21. Variorum, p. 377.
22. Facsimile, p. 205.
23. Variorum, p. 260.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid., p. 346.
26. Facsimile, p. 202.
27. Ibid.
28. Variorum, p. 362.
29. Facsimile, p. 187.
30. Variorum, p. 325.
31. The Tale of Gamelyn also has two brothers.
32. Facsimile, p. 187.
33. Thomas Lodge, Lodge's "Rosalynde," Being the Original of Shakespeare's "As You Like It," ed. W. W. Greg (New York: Duffield and Company, 1907), p. xviii.
34. Ibid., pp. xviii-xix.
35. William Flint Thrall and Addison Hibbard, A Handbook to Literature (New York: The Odyssey Press, 1936), p. 170.
36. Variorum, p. 326.
37. Ibid., p. 373.
38. Ibid., p. 377.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid., p. 378.
41. Ibid., p. 334.
42. Ibid.
43. Ibid.
44. Ibid., p. 319.
45. Ibid., p. 320.

46. Ibid.
47. Ibid., p. 371.
48. Ibid., p. 378.
49. Ibid., p. 347.
50. Ibid., p. 381.
51. H. N. Ellacombe, The Plant-Lore and Garden-Craft of Shakespeare (London: E. Arnold, 1896), pp. 1-2.
52. Variorum, p. 352.
53. Ibid., p. 328.
54. Ibid., p. 321.
55. Ibid., p. 350.
56. Ibid., p. 347.
57. Ibid., p. 320.
58. Ibid., p. 371.
59. Ibid., p. 350.
60. Ibid., p. 372.
61. Ibid., p. 373.
62. Ibid., p. 381.
63. Ibid., p. 377.
64. Ibid., p. 321.
65. Ibid., p. 319.
66. Ibid., p. 318.
67. Ibid., p. 319.
68. Emma Phipson, The Animal-Lore of Shakespeare's Time (London: K. Paul, Trench & Company, 1883), p. 250.
69. Variorum, p. 321.
70. Phipson, p. 192.
71. Variorum, p. 377.

72. Lodge, p. xv.
73. Variorum, p. 317.
74. Ibid., p. 352.
75. Ibid., p. 373.
76. Ibid., p. 342.
77. Ibid., p. 319.
78. Caroline F.E. Spurgeon, Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935), pp. 276-280.
79. Ibid., p. 276.
80. Facsimile, p. 198.
81. Ibid.
82. Spurgeon, pp. 276-277.
83. Ibid., p. 277.
84. Ibid.
85. Ibid., p. 278.
86. Ibid., pp. 278-279.
87. Ibid., p. 279.
88. Ibid.
89. Ibid.
90. Ibid., pp. 279-280.
91. Facsimile, p. 185.
92. Ibid., p. 186.
93. Ibid., p. 203.
94. Ibid., p. 193.
95. Ibid., p. 192.
96. Variorum, p. 95n.
97. Facsimile, p. 193.

98. Variorum, p. 113.
99. Facsimile, p. 200.
100. Ibid., p. 197.
101. Variorum, p. 173n.
102. Facsimile, p. 191.
103. Variorum, p. 86n.
104. Facsimile, p. 185.
105. Ibid.
106. Ibid.
107. Ibid., p. 186.
108. Ibid.
109. Ibid., p. 189.
110. Ibid.
111. Ibid.
112. Ibid.
113. Ibid., p. 195.
114. Ibid., p. 203.
115. Ibid., p. 206.
116. Ibid., p. 190.
117. Ibid., p. 199.
118. Variorum, p. 204n.
119. Facsimile, p. 199.
120. Ibid., p. 189.
121. Ibid., p. 198.
122. Ibid., p. 200.
123. Ibid.
124. Ibid., p. 196.

125. Ibid., p. 197.
126. Ibid., p. 199.
127. Ibid.
128. Ibid., p. 200.
129. Ibid.
130. Ibid., p. 185.
131. Ibid., p. 186.
132. Ibid., p. 188.
133. Ibid.
134. Ibid., p. 186.
135. Ibid., p. 203.
136. Ibid., p. 192.
137. Ibid.
138. Ibid., p. 203.
139. Ibid., p. 207.
140. Ibid.
141. Ibid.

CHAPTER FOUR

Although there are a number of areas of imagery in Barnaby Rich's tale Apolonius and Silla, the two which dominate are sickness and value. Because dominant areas of imagery can be distinguished, the tale more closely resembles Romeus and Juliet than it does Rosalynde, and, as in the former, its imagery affords an interpretation which reveals a carefully constructed statement about how one should conduct himself when in love. Shakespeare's Twelfth Night, although in some respects closer to the imagery of its source than either of the other two plays examined, again is an example of the way in which Shakespeare attained originality through imitation.

Riche his Farewell to Militarie profession, first published in 1581, is a collection of tales, one of which, Of Apolonius and Silla, is accepted by most critics as the primary source of Shakespeare's Twelfth Night. Such is Barnaby Rich's chief claim to fame, even though at least six other English plays appear to have used materials from one or another of the tales.¹ Obviously, in its own time the collection was very popular, just as Romeus and Juliet and Rosalynde were. Rich, who died in the year following Shakespeare's death, saw four editions of his work, the last in 1606. Of those four editions, only six copies survive. As Professor Cranfill

comments

Ordinary readers were apparently as devoted to Rich's folk as were the playwrights--sufficiently devoted, that is, to read out of existence all but (1) a single copy of the first edition, 1581, which may have survived in fine condition only because it reposed (unread, one suspects) for who knows how many years in the austere library of Thomas Tanner (1674-1734), bishop of St. Asaph, from whom it went directly to the Bodleian Library; (2) two imperfect copies of the second edition, 1583, both of which narrowly escaped being read to pieces, having been handled until what is left of them is ragged, tattered, and torn; (3) a single imperfect copy of the third edition, 1594, which may owe its survival partly to the stout neighbor it is stalwartly bound with; and (4) two copies of the fourth edition, 1606.²

No firm conclusions about the author's purpose can be drawn from the prefatory material of the Farewell. Rich saw his audience as comprising three distinct groups: "the right courteous gentlewomen, both of Englande and Irelande"; "the noble Souldiours bothe of Englande and Irelande"; and "the Readers in general." To each of these groups Rich addresses a dedicatory epistle.

He tells the ladies that he has learned from experience that it is wiser to be a follower of Venus than of Mars and, since he cannot please them by dancing, singing, or conversation, having neither skill nor talent for any of these pastimes, he will instead present them with his stories.³ These tales have been "so warely polished, that there is nothyng let slipp, that might breede offence to your modest myndes."⁴ After establishing their inoffensiveness, Rich continues:

I have made bolde to publishe them under your savecundites, and I trust it shall nothyng at all offende you: My last request is, that at your pleasures you will peruse them, and with your favours you will defende them, whiche, if I maie perceive, not to bee misliked of emongest you, my encouragement will bee suche, that I trust within a verie shorte space, you shall see me growe from a yong Punie, to a sufficient Scholer. And thus (gentlewomen) wishyng to you all, what your selves doe beste like of, I humbly take my leave.⁵

Throughout the letter his tone is light and, perhaps, mocking, quite in contrast to that of the letter to the soldiers.

Addressing these, Rich reiterates the wisdom of following Venus rather than Mars, but his tone is bitter and his remarks expand the significance of the title of the collection.

I dare boldly affirme . . . that wit standes by in a thredbare coate, where folly sometyme sittes in a Velvet gounne, and . . . often is it seen that vice shall be aduanced, where vertue is little or naught at all regarded, small deserte shall highly be preferred, where wel doying shall goe unrewarded, and flatterie shall be welcomed for a guest of great accompt, where plaine Tom tell troth, shall be thrust out of doores by the shoulders: and to speake a plaine truthe in deede, doe ye not see, Pipers, Parysites, Fidlers, Dauncers, Plaiers, Jesters, and suche others, better esteemed and made of, and greater benevolence used towarde them, then to any others that indeuours themselves to the most commendable qualities.⁶

True enough, Rich continues, he had envisioned his next book to be a treatise on warfare, particularly in the low countries, but the histories he is presenting in the Farewell "fitte the tyme the better."⁷

Rich notes that the traditionally honorable avenues to worldly success--arms, the court, law, commerce, agriculture, handicraft--are no longer open for the honest man.⁸ Accordingly, he advises his "fellowe Souldiours" to

laie aside your weapons, hang up your armour by the walles, and learne an other while (for your better aduancementes) to Pipe, to Feddle, to Syng, to Daunce, to lye, to forge, to flatter, to cary tales, to set Ruffe, or to dooe any thyng that your appetites beste serves unto, and that is better fittyng for the tyme.⁹

But what of lasting importance is to be learned from these observations on "the course of the worlde"?

Simply that corrective measures must be taken if England is to avoid a cataclysm.

And although it hath pleased God by wonderfull signes and miracles, to forewarne us of his wrathe, and call us to repentaunce, yet you see the worlde runneth forwardes, & keepeth his wonted course, without any remorse of conscience, neither making signe, nor proffer to amende. But like as we see an old sore beyng once over run, will not be cured with any moderate medicine, but must be eaten with corosives till it comes to the quicke: and like as wee saie, one poison must bee a meane, to expell an other. So what should wee otherwise thinke of our selves, but if wee bee growne to such extremitie, as no gentill admonition will serve to reclaime us: what other thyng should we looke for, but a mischief to be the Medicine: God will not suffer that vice shall alwaies florish, he will surely roote it out at the laste.¹⁰

Thus is Rich revealed in his humorless moral stance. Had he concluded his letter to the soldiers on this pessimistic note, which seems indeed the logical conclusion, the contrast between the first and the second prefaces would have been even greater than it is.

However, the bitterness of his remarks is somewhat mitigated by the obligatory compliment to Elizabeth. England is in danger and her enemies are powerful, but God is on the side of the English.

For who knoweth not what an eyesore, this little Ile of Englande, hath been to the whole worlde, and how long have we lived (as it were) in contempt of such Countries as be our nexte neighbours, who still enveighing our quiet and happie government: have practized by as many devises as thei could, to bring us into their owne predicament, had it not been the onely providence of GOD that preserved us.¹¹

As evidence of this divine providence, Rich points to the survival of the queen, "our moste gracious and Soveraigne Ladie Queene Elizabeth, who from tyme to time he hath so mightily preserved, to be the verie instrumente of his mercie, and lovyng kindnesse towardes us."¹² Elizabeth has interceded on the behalf of her people to protect them from the wrath of God; and for her sake "he hath forborne us in his displeasure, as many tymes he did the children of Israell,

at the request of his servaunt Moyses."¹³ His pretty compliment to Elizabeth weakens the effect of his criticism of England.

The final dedicatory epistle, addressed "To the Readers in generall," is an apology for the contents, and it neither mocks nor satirizes. The stories are, Rich claims, intended only to please and delight; five are original "tales . . . forged onely for delight, neither credible to be beleved, nor hurtfull to be perused" and three are from the Italian, "written likewise for pleasure."¹⁴ They are not written to offend.

And here gētill reader, I must instauntly intreate thee. That if thou findest any wordes or tearmes, semyng more undecent, then peradventure thou wilte like of: thinke that I have set them doune, as more aproprate to express the matter thei intreate of, then either for want of judgement or good manners. Trustyng that as I have written them in Jest, so thou wilt read them but to make thy self merie. I wishe thei might as well please thee in the reading, as thei displease me in puttyng them forthe.¹⁵

Possibly, Rich was doing nothing more than advertising the salaciousness of the stories, but the epistle addressed to the soldiers and to Elizabeth suggests that he was sincere in all instances--sincere and inconsistent.

The inconsistency which marks the dedicatory remarks might tempt one to expect a similar inconsistency in the imagery of the tales. However, Apolonius and Silla has an organized imagery, even though it is not immediately apparent.

Like all the works analyzed thus far, Brooke's poem, Lodge's romance, and the two plays of Shakespeare, Apolonius and Silla is marked by a richness of imagery which tends to obscure any dominating imagery. A number of areas can be distinguished.

Rich capitalizes on the Renaissance penchant for personifying fortune. For example, the brother of Silla, Silvio, reasons that it would be a "poincte of greate simplicitie, if he should forsake that, which Fortune had so favourably proffered unto hym."¹⁶ Julina complains that "inconstant fortune . . . devised this treason wherein I am surprised and caught."¹⁷ And Silla, revealing herself to be a woman, answers Julina's charges by saying, "I knowe not Madame, of whom I might make complaint, whether of you or of my self, or rather of Fortune, which hath conducted and brought us both into so great adversitie."¹⁸ Unlike Brooke's Romeus and Juliet, however, these allusions to fortune are few and not really significant.

Similarly, a number of interesting figures drawn from various occupations and professions are for the same reason insignificant. For example, the love-stricken Silla, swearing a servant to secrecy, is like a magician "conjuring him in the name of the Goddes of Love her self."¹⁹ And Duke Apolonius is once compared to a schoolboy when he falls in love with Julina, thus becoming "a scholler in Loves Schoole . . . [who] had alreadie learned his first lesson . . . [and] was learnyng his seconde."²⁰

Since Rich was a soldier, it is not surprising to find more than a single image related to his profession. About the captain who falls in love with Silla while transporting her from Cyprus, Rich says that he was "taken prisoner aboard his owne Shippe, and forced to yeeld hym self a captive without any Cannon shot."²¹ A similar metaphor is used by Silla when she rejects his proposal of marriage and "desired hym to fire his fancie uppon some that were

better worthie then her self was."²² What does surprise is Rich's infrequent use of metaphors drawn from the arts of war.

Suggesting a layman's knowledge of law, bits and pieces of legal jargon are scattered throughout the tale. The disguised Silla, for example, goes as a messenger carrying "tokens and love letters" to Julina from Apolonius, and is thus made "the instrumente to woorke her owne mishapp, and to plaie the Attorney in a cause, that made so muche againste her self."²³ Julina's confession of her indiscretion with Silvio, "testimonie" inadvertently elicited by the duke, smacks of common law. She asks Silla, disguised as a page, how he can deny her since she, Julina, is the one "to whom thou are contracted by so many solemne othes." It is Silvio that she "received . . . for my spouse and loyall housbande, swearyng by the almightie God, that no other then you have made the cōquest and triumphe of my chastitie, whereof I crave no other witnesse then your self."²⁴ There were, of course, no other witnesses. Julina's confusion of Silla for her brother Silvio, the narrator comments, is "a foule oversight of Julina, that would so precisely sweare so greate an othe, that she was gotten with childe by one, that was altogether unfurnishte with implementes for such a tourne."²⁵

Rich also draws on the world of nature for his imagery. Only two instances of plant imagery occur. In a well-worn compliment the duke calls Silla "the braunche of all vertue, and the flowre of curtesie it self."²⁶ The other is more unusual and occurs in the transitional passage between the appointment and the enjoyment of Julina's tryst with Silvio. In this passage Rich capitalizes on a universal, the slowness with which time passes for anyone eagerly

anticipating a forthcoming event: "And as Julina did thinke the tyme verie long, till she had reapte the fruite of her desire: so Silvio he wishte for Harvest, before Corne could growe, thinkyng the tyme as long."²⁷ Here Rich anticipates Marvell's "vegetable love."

Imagery of birds and animals helps Rich to distinguish the subject of his tale. His description of Apolonius, Silla, and Julina as a "Leishe of Lovers, a male and twoo femalles"²⁸ caused Cranfill to remark on Rich's "writing not 'a man and two women,' but 'a male and two females,' as if they were a dog and two bitches."²⁹

Others of the allusions are more thematic. Equestrian allusions are employed by the disguised Silla when she asks:

What lawe is able to restraine the foolishe indiscretion of a woman, that yeeldeth her self to her owne desires, what shame is able to bridle or withdrawe her from her mynd and madnesse, or with what snaffell is it possible to holde her back, from the execution of her filthinesse?³⁰

Suggestive as it is of the power of the human passions, the imagery appropriately describes the forces motivating Julina's wanton surrender to Silvio.

Rich is not consistent in the suggestion that the passions drive people to imprudent positive actions; they are as often trapped. Silla, realizing the hopelessness of falling in love with a handsome stranger who is only a guest at her father's court, "therefore strived with her self to leave her fondnesse, but all in vaine it would not bee, but like the foule whiche is once Limed, the more she striveth, the faster she tieth her self."³¹ A similar idea of trapping is suggested by Silla's feeding Apolonius with "amorous baites."³² Julina also sees herself as being "surprised and caught" and "intangled with snares," "a prae to satisfie a yong mans lust," but the descriptions are hers, not the narrator's.

The characters of Silla and Julina are effectively contrasted by variants in the imagery of trapping. The narrator says that Silla has been caught by love; on the other hand, Julina describes herself as love's prey when, as the reader knows, she has been the willing victim of her own lust. Silla's overtures to Apolonius do not transgress the bounds which "the modestie of a maide, could reasonably afforde."³³ Compare these "amourous baites" with the meal enjoyed by Silvio and Julina, who pass "the Supper tyme with amarous lokes, lovyng countenaunces, and secret glaūce conueighed from the one to the other, which ded better satisfie them, then the feedyng of their daintie dishes."³⁴ This distinction between Silla and Julina, subtly made by the imagery relating to trapping, suggests the unity of imagery which can be discovered in the tale, a unity to which the next series of images is central.

The metaphor of sickness is introduced in the Farewell when Rich likens the state of English morality to "an old sore beyng once over run," and this metaphor recurs early in the tale of Apolonius and Silla. Apolonius' failure to notice Silla is laid to his recent combat whence, "from the chasyng of his enemies, and his furie not yet throughly desolved, nor purged from his stomacke," he has returned unfit for the offices of love.³⁵ In similar allusions to sickness Rich may describe any strong emotion, but most particularly love. Thus, Apolonius departs for his dukedom leaving behind a grieving Silla, and the narrator declines to repeat the "long and dolorous discourse recorded by Silla" since he knows his readers "to bee as tenderly harted as Silla her self, whereby you maie the better conjecture the furie of her Fever."³⁶ In the event that

some reader might be so inhuman as to imagine inadequately Silla's lovesickness, the narrator begins the following paragraph by repeating that "Silla the further that she sawe her self bereved of all hope, ever any more to see her beloved Apolonius, so much the more contagious were her passions."³⁷ The effect of these metaphors is clear: love is a sickness.

By suggesting a universal understanding of Silla's lovesickness, Rich arouses sympathy for her. On the other hand, Julina's lovesickness, which leads to her excesses, makes one wonder what can prevent a woman guilty of such "foolish indiscretion" from following "her mynd and madnesse."³⁸ Furthermore, the narrator leeringly reports of Silvio and Julina that "thei passed the night with such joye and contentation, as might in that convenient tyme be wished for, but onely that Julina, feedyng too muche of some one dishe above the reste, received a surfet, whereof she could not bee cured in fourtie wekes after."³⁹ Julina's pregnancy is thus described in a metaphor of sickness, continued when Julina, anxious about the absence of her lover, "beganne to thinke that all was not well, but in the ende, perceivng no decoction of her former surfette" decides to seek out the duke's page "mindyng to finde a present remedie."⁴⁰ The imagery of sickness provides an important distinction between the characters of Silla and Julina. Although neither is able to escape love, the malady affects them quite differently.

Intensifying the contrast between Silla and Julina is a final group of images, for which Julina is largely responsible. In metaphors of wealth, as in Romeo and Juliet, Rosalynde, and As You Like It, the beloved is equated with something of great monetary value.

Julina describes Silvio as he "whom I doe esteeme more then all the Jewells in the worlde."⁴¹ She also remembers the "first daie that mine eyes did beholde, the singuler behaviour, the notable curtesies, and other innumerable giftes wherwith my Silvio is endued."⁴²

Julina similarly describes the love she offers. Confronting Silvio on the street for the first time and mistaking him for his disguised sister, Julina reproaches him:

Seyng my good will and frendly love, hath been the onely cause to make me so prodigall to offer, that I see is so lightly rejected, it maketh me to thinke, that men bee of this condiction, rather to desire those thynges, whiche thei can not come by, then to esteeme or value of that, which bothe largely and liberallie is offered unto them, but if the liberalitie of my proffer, hath made to seme lesse the value of the thing that I ment to present, it is but in your own cceipt [sic], confideyng how many noble men there hath been here before, and be yet at this present, which hath bothe served, sued, and moste humbly inteated, to attaine to that, whiche to you of my self, I have freely offred, and I perceive is dispised, or at the least verie lightly regarded.⁴³

Julina's analysis of value is timeless; men value that which is scarce. Her chance meeting with Silvio results in her taking "an earnest penie" in exchange for her virtue, a bargain which the "surfeit" to follow causes her to rue.⁴⁴

Not only does the imagery of wealth evaluate; it also points out the worthlessness of love without honor. "Findyng in her self, an unwonted swellyng in her beallie, assuryng her self to bee with chyld, fearyng to become quite banckroute of her honour,"⁴⁵ Julina hurries to Apolonius' palace to confront the disguised Silla, charging the latter with "injoying the spoyles of my honor,"⁴⁶ and demanding if her treatment is "the recompence of the honest and firme amitie." Has she "deserved this discourtesie, by loving thee more

then thou art able to deserve?" Does the page think her "no better worthe, but that thou maiest waste my honour at thy pleasure?" Believing these desperate charges made by the woman he loves, the duke draws his rapier and threatens Silla, addressing the disguised girl as "arrant theefe," a phrase previously used by Julina. Through this imagery the lesson that Julina has so painfully learned is manifested: love and honor are inseparable. Julina's charges are patently false. But, even if they were true, they would be unfair, for she has violated her honor by carelessly giving herself to one whose status is uncertain. She has played a dangerous game and lost, and the imagery of value underscores the amount of the wager.

The imagery of Apolonius and Silla, then, has two dominating metaphors, sickness and value, which together suggest the purpose of the tale, that desert rather than beauty is the basis for a "reasonable love."⁴⁷ No man escapes error, for any "child that is borne into this wretched world . . . before it doeth sucke the mothers Milke . . . taketh first a soope of the Cupp of errorr."⁴⁸ Although error can be seen in all human activities, "we shewe our selves to bee moste dronken with this poisoned Cupp . . . in our actions of Love," for the lover is most often guided by appetite and not reason.⁴⁹ Duke Apolonius, Silla, and Julina are all afflicted by the sickness of love; but an important distinction is made between the love Silla has for Apolonius and he for Julina and that of Julina for Silvio.

Silla and Apolonius are deserving of love, both in rank and in conduct. Julina, who "would preferre her love unto suche a one, as Nature it self had denaied to recompence her likyng,"⁵⁰ demonstrates

that she is the character most drunken with error, for her love is based on appearance alone and disregards the worth and rank of the person beloved. The imagery of value shows how much Julina very nearly paid, without recompense, for her "likyng." In the end Julina, like Milton's Satan, almost steals the show; unlike Satan, she is not made to pay the full price for her folly, but, after all, her sin hardly compares.

Furness, it is amusing to note, refused to acknowledge Apolonius and Silla as the source of Twelfth Night. "There is," he wrote, "a coarse, unrefined atmosphere throughout Riche's story, whereof there is, of course, not the smallest trace in Shakespeare's comedy."⁵¹ However, most modern critics agree Rich's tale is the primary source for the main plot of the play.⁵²

Muir not only accepts Apolonius and Silla as the source of Twelfth Night; he goes even further by suggesting that Rich's dedicatory epistle addressed to women may perhaps be responsible for certain features of "the picture we get of Sir Andrew."⁵³ However, he notes only one possible verbal echo of the tale in Twelfth Night: he says

Julina's words:

Ah, unhappie, and above all other, most unhappie, that have so charely preserved myne honour, and now am made a prairie to satisfie a yong mans lust.

may have suggested Olivia's words to Viola:

I have said too much unto a hart of stone,
And laid mine honour too unchary out.⁵⁴

Other possible echoes exist. Rich's description of the subjective passage of time:

And as Julina did thinke the tyme verie long, till she had reapte the fruite of her desire: so Silvio he wishte for Harvest, before corne could growe, thinkyng the tyme as long.

compares with Olivia's words to the disguised Viola:

The clock upbraids me with the waste of time:
Be not affraid good youth, I will not have you,
And yet when wit and youth is come to harvest,
your wife is like to reape a proper man.⁵⁵

The conjunction of the subjects of time and harvest make it unlikely that the two passages are coincidental.

In addition to this remarkable parallel, there are at least two others. In the first Rich compares Silla, just after she has met and fallen in love with Apolonius, to "the foule whiche is once Limed" whose struggles to free itself only further entangle it. It may be that Shakespeare had this image in mind when Malvolio, mistakenly imagining he has won Olivia's heart, says, "I have lymde her."⁵⁶ However, this metaphor was a relatively commonplace one, and of little significance by itself.

The second concerns Rich's consistent reference to Julina's pregnancy as a "surfette." Shakespeare has Orsino distinguish the difference between a man's and a woman's love; the latter's

love may be call'd appetite
No motion of the Liver, but the Pallat,
That suffer surfet, cloyment, and revolt.⁵⁷

Needless to say, Viola's presence in the play suffices to demonstrate that the duke is mistaken.

These verbal echoes afford slight support to the theory that Apolonius and Silla is the source of Twelfth Night, but, as Muir points out, there is abundant evidence, even in the absence of any verbal parallels.

Riche's version and Giraldi's are the only ones that introduce a shipwreck; and Silvio's acceptance of Julina's invitation, Julina's revelation of her betrothal, her criticism of Silvio's fearful refusal to acknowledge it, and the

Duke's anger with Silla are sufficiently close to the corresponding scenes of Twelfth Night to make it certain that Shakespeare knew Riche's version.⁵⁸

Another significant indication is the similarity of the imagery in the two works, a resemblance closer than that between Romeus and Juliet and Romeo and Juliet or Rosalynde and As You Like It. This close relationship can be demonstrated only after an intensive examination of the play's imagery.

Unlike her work with some of Shakespeare's plays, Caroline Spurgeon's analysis of Twelfth Night is superficial. She says that "out of a hundred images there are only fourteen which can be called poetical."⁵⁹ This and her observation that the play contains an unusual number of topical images comprise very nearly everything specific she has to say about Twelfth Night. Generally, she says the play's images "reflect subtly and accurately the rather peculiar mixture of tones in the play, music, romance, sadness and beauty interwoven with wit, broad comedy, and quick-moving snapping dialogue" and "give a lightness and brilliance to the play which must have delighted the early audience, and which keep alive the atmosphere of repartee and topical fun which is one of the characteristics of this sophisticated and delicious comedy."⁶⁰ Her remarks do not do justice to the play.

Naturally, and as Professor Spurgeon notes, much of the imagery of the play reflects the world of the playwright. The topical images she cites are examples:

the Sir Toby scenes, such as his declaration that "he's a coward . . . that will not drink to my niece, till his brains turn o' the toe like a parish-top," or his direction to Sir Andrew to scout for him "at the corner of the

orchard like a bum-bailly," Viola's message that she will stand at Olivia's door "like a sheriff's post," Maria's well-known comparison of the lines in Malvolio's face to the "new map," the clown's comparison of a cheveril glove to a good wit, or Sir Toby's sheet of paper "big enough for the bed of Ware in England."⁶¹

She could have noted other examples of this topical imagery.

The play was performed at least once before the residents of the Middle Temple,⁶² who would have appreciated legal imagery, such as Olivia's allusion to the drawing of a will when she says that her beauty

shalbe Inventoried and every particle and utensile labell'd to my will: As, Item two lippes indifferent redde, Item two grey eyes, with lids to them: Item, one necke, one chin, & so forth.⁶³

There is also Sir Andrew Aguecheek's compliance with the niceties of the code duello in the challenge he sends Cesario⁶⁴ and his comment to Toby after being beaten by Sebastian:

Nay let him alone. Ile go another way to worke with him: Ile have an action of Battery against him, if there be any law in Illyria: though I stroke him first, yet it's no matter for that.⁶⁵

This speech of Sir Andrew would have illustrated how completely a fool he was; knowing he has no case,⁶⁶ he nevertheless is willing to sue.

Painting and sculpture also provide topical allusions. Two passages refer to popular works of art. The first occurs when the clown enters to find Sir Toby and Sir Andrew abroad after midnight; he greets them: "How now my harts: Did you never see the picture of we three?"⁶⁷ The subject of this allusion is believed to be a popular print or, perhaps, sign depicting two asses or two fools, under which was the caption, "We Three Are Asses" or "We Three

Loggerheads Be."⁶⁸ That there are only two figures portrayed is the point of the clown's jest. The second allusion occurs when Viola describes for Orsino her fictitious sister's love: as she languished

She sate like Patience on a Monument,
Smiling at greefe.⁶⁹

Although Theobald conjectured the allusion was to Chaucer's Parlement of Fowles, others suspect these lines referred to some actual or imagined statuary.⁷⁰

Two other allusions to art involve an elaborate play on words. Viola, in the role of Cesario, asks Olivia to drop the veil which covers her face and the countess agrees:

O1. But we will draw the Curtain, and shew you the picture. Looke you sir, such a one I was this present:
Ist not well done?

Vio. Excellently done, if God did all.

O1. 'Tis in grain sir, 'twill endure winde and weather.

Vio. Tis beauty truly blent, whose red and white,
Natures owne sweet, and cunning hand laid on:
Lady, you are the cruell'st shee alive,
If you will leade these graces to the grave,
And leave the world no copie.⁷¹

To understand these lines properly, it is helpful to consider a speech of Toby's in which he satirically commends Sir Andrew's dancing by wondering why his gull's accomplishments have not before been revealed to him: "Wherefore are these things hid? Wherefore have these gifts a Curtaine before em? Are they like to take dust, like mistris Mals picture?"⁷² These lines, according to Halliwell, were made "in allusion to the custom which prevailed in Shakespeare's time, of oil paintings being protected by curtains, which were only drawn on particular occasions or for exhibition."⁷³ Thus, in the dialogue involving Viola and Olivia, the latter compares her face to a painting.

Viola compliments her, and at the same time slyly raises the question whether nature or art is responsible for her rival's beauty. Olivia's reply indicates her beauty is truly skin deep, whereupon Viola, in her role as a page, then extends a lavish courtly compliment to Olivia: such a work of art by God and Nature must not perish without leaving a "copie," a child.

As he so often does, Shakespeare mirrors the natural world in Twelfth Night. A number of the nature allusions in the play are to birds, as, for example, Toby's description of Maria as "the youngest Wren."⁷⁴ Most probably, the comparison was inspired by Maria's small size.⁷⁵ Instructed by the letter he believes to be from Olivia to be "surly with servants"⁷⁶ Malvolio complies by deciding to answer Maria, and thereby indicating his opinion of the social gap between them: "Nightingales answere dawes," he says.⁷⁷ There is one allusion to falconry which depends on a knowledge of that art for its meaning. Viola observes that, if one is a professional fool, he must seize upon every opportunity for jesting; the clown must

like the Haggard, checke at every Feather
That comes before his eye.⁷⁸

The haggard was a wild hawk that had not been captured and trained until it had attained adulthood, which resulted in its killing ruthlessly almost any other birds unlucky enough to cross its path.⁷⁹

The savagery of this latter image is reflected in very nearly all the allusions to animals in the play. Olivia illustrates this point in the space of a few lines. As she unashamedly woos Viola, who is of course disguised as Orsino's page, Olivia says,

- Have you not set mine Honor at the stake,
And baited it with all th'unmuzled thoughts
That tyrannous heart can think?⁸⁰

Since the allusion is to bear baiting, Olivia is accusing the page of having sport by deliberately teasing her. But, since Viola is not at fault, the accusation is unjustified. Viola disclaims any love for Olivia a few lines later, and the latter laments her plight:

If one should be a prey, how much the better
To fall before the Lion, then the Wolfe?⁸¹

The person in love is a victim, and the quality of one's persecutor matters not a whit.

The bear is the animal most often alluded to in the play, but it is never clear whether he is victim or persecutor. Sometimes, he is the antagonist. Fabian tells Toby that Viola, disguised as Cesario, is as afraid of Sir Andrew as Sir Andrew is of the page, who "pants, & lookes pale, as if a Beare were at his heeles."⁸² Oddly enough, Viola is yet again the inspiration of an ursine allusion when Orsino, infuriated by the priest's tale of the marriage of Olivia and Sebastian, turns on his page and angrily says

O thou dissembling Cub: what wilt thou be
When time hath sow'd a grizzle on thy case?⁸³

Sometimes, he is the victim. Toby and Fabian discuss the trick they and Maria are playing on the steward:

Fab. If I loose a scruple of this sport, let me be
boyl'd to death with Melancholly.

To. Wouldst thou not be glad to have the niggardly
Rascally sheepe-biter, come by some notable shame?

Fa. I would exult man: you know he brought me out
o'favour with my Lady, about a Beare-baiting heere.

To. To anger him wee'l have the Beare againe, and
we will foole him blacke and blew.⁸⁴

Malvolio is thus referred to as a bear, and perhaps also as a dog.

Olivia's complaint about being a prey is only one of a number of allusions to hunting. At the very beginning of the play, for example, the subject offers Orsino an opportunity to pun as he answers Curio:

Cu. Will you go hunt my Lord?

Du. What Curio?

Cu. The Hart.

Du. Why so I do, the Noblest that I have.⁸⁵

In this last line the duke, of course, alludes to Olivia, and she and hunting remind him of the story of Diana and Acteon. Like Acteon, when Orsino first saw Olivia,

That instant was I turn'd into a Hart,
And my desires like fell and cruell hounds,
Ere since pursue me.⁸⁶

He, too, pictures himself as the victim of love. Orsino's pun on "heart"/"hart" is echoed by Olivia when she says to Sebastian, whom she mistakes for Cesario, that her cousin Toby's attempt to duel him "started one poore heart of mine, in thee."⁸⁷ The verb "started" very clearly indicates the pun on "hart" is intended. As in the bear-baiting allusions, these references to hunting emphasize the sometimes violent fate of the prey, thus implying that the victim of love is a game animal.

The surprisingly few other nature images also reflect the violence of the natural world. For example, Viola in her guise as Cesario tells Orsino about a sister, and thus herself, who

never told her love,
But let concealment like a worme i the budde
Feede on her damaske cheekes.⁸⁸

This repugnant simile, beautifully stated, again presents the lover as victim. In an allusion to fish the clown implies husbands are

likewise victims of love: "fooles are as like husbands, as Pilchers are to Herrings, the Husbands the bigger."⁸⁹ In both these allusions the person who loves is ultimately destined to become the prey.

The imagery discussed thus far is not central to the play. More significant are other groups of images which, together, suggest some of the major concerns of Twelfth Night.

The imagery of Apolonius and Silla was organized around the dominant metaphors of value and sickness. Sickness metaphors also abound in Twelfth Night. One instance, that echo of Rich's "surfette" has been cited. There are many more.

Some of the language relating to sickness could hardly have been avoided, for the events of the play necessitate them. For example, there is Andrew's call for a surgeon after he and Toby have been thrashed by Sebastian. References only obligatory are relatively few in number, however.

More often, imagery relating to sickness has no necessary connection with the plot of the play. Indeed, some of these references seem to represent nothing more than a very natural application of a frozen or trite metaphor. Toby's "What a plague meanes my Neece to take the death of her brother thus?"⁹⁰ or his "A plague o'these pickle herring,"⁹¹ illustrate this usage.

More interesting, but almost as insignificant, are those instances of imagery which allude to beliefs commonly held about disease. For example, Toby and Andrew comment on a song they have just heard:

An. A mellifluous voyce, as I am true knight.

To. A contagious breath.

An. Very sweet and contagious, ifaith.

To. To hear by the nose, it is dulcet in contagion.⁹²

Toby, of course, is poking fun at Sir Andrew's ignorance, probably because the knight has failed to recognize the pun involving "catch"/"contagious." Sebastian also employs the metaphor of a contagious disease when he attempts to discourage Antonio from endangering himself by remaining in Illyria; he tells his friend that "my starres shine darkely over me; the malignancie of my fate, might perhaps distemper yours."⁹³ But, taken together, all such examples of imagery relating to sickness and disease, regardless of the insignificance of each, suggest the prominence of this imagery in the play.

A pair of conflicting statements provides a starting point for the understanding of this imagery. Orsino describes his first sight of Olivia:

O when mine eyes did see Olivia first,
Me thought she purg'd the air of pestilence.⁹⁴

The implication of these lines, that the person loved prevents disease, is seemingly contradicted only a few lines farther on in the play when Olivia, after Cesario's departure, muses to herself:

How now?
Even so quickly may one catch the plague?
Me thinkes I feele this youths perfections
With an invisible, and subtle stealth
To creepe in at mine eyes.⁹⁵

Olivia views love as a disease, a view she earlier states when she reproves Malvolio by saying, "O you are sicke of selfe-love Malvolio, and taste with a distemper'd appetite."⁹⁶ The question raised by these statements is whether love is or is not a disease.

The character of Malvolio provides at least a partial answer to that question. Of all the characters in the play, Malvolio is

probably the most memorable. For him, Shakespeare is indebted to no one. While Malvolio's presence in the play does add to the comedy and, perhaps, also affords the opportunity for satire directed against the Puritans, the subplot involving him and his tormentors is integral to the business of the play. Olivia's characterization of Malvolio as one who is "sick of self-love" together with his actions and his treatment permit an exact diagnosis of his malady: he is mad, for, according to Robert Burton, that is the sickness caused by self love.⁹⁷

Madness is the sickness most often alluded to in the play, and, because the subplot is primarily concerned with the tricking of Malvolio, he is central to much of the imagery involving that malady. For example, in laying the groundwork for her plot against Malvolio, Maria convinces Olivia that the steward is insane.

Ol. Where's Malvolio, he is sad, and civill,
And suites well for a servant with my fortunes,
Where is Malvolio?

Mar. He's comming Madame:
But in very strange manner. He is sure possest Madam.

Ol. Why what's the matter, does he rave?

Mar. No Madam, he does nothing but smile: your Ladyship were best to have some guard about you, if hee come, for sure the man is tainted in's wits.⁹⁸

Maria's success is signaled by Olivia's response to Malvolio's fantastic humorous conduct; the countess says to her steward, "Heaven restore thee," and "Why, this is verie Midsommer madness."⁹⁹

Olivia's latter statement echoes a well-established commonplace associating midsummer with madness,¹⁰⁰ as does Shakespeare's

Midsummer Night's Dream and Burton's reference to "Midsummer moon."¹⁰¹

Although they know better, Toby, Fabian, and Maria treat Malvolio as though he were indeed mad. Toby, making reference to the belief that insanity was the result of one's being possessed by devils,¹⁰² enters and looks about for Malvolio, saying

Which way is hee in the name of sanctity? If all the diuels of hell be drawne in little, and Legion himselfe possest him, yet Ile speake to him.¹⁰³

The three plotters continue to rag Malvolio; and one, Fabian, indicates that, although the cause of insanity might be possession by devils, there is nevertheless the possibility of a cure. "Carry his water to th'wise woman," he says.¹⁰⁴ Douce cites a play by Heywood in which two such wise women claim skill in "casting of Waters" and curing of "madd folkes."¹⁰⁵

Toby suggests another conventional treatment for the insane:¹⁰⁶

Come, wee'll have him in a darke room & bound. My Neece is already in the beleefe that he's mad: we may carry it thus for our pleasure, and his pennance, til our very pastime tyred out of breath, prompt us to have mercy on him: at which time, we will bring the device to the bar and crowne thee for a finder of madmen.¹⁰⁷

Feste joins the three who initiated the plot by disguising himself as Sir Topas, the curate. Parenthetically, the name for the curate may have been selected for the allusion it makes to madness. Furness discovered that Reginald Scot's Discoverie of Witchcraft (1584) contains the following information about the topaz: "A topase healeth the lunatike person of his passion of lunacie."¹⁰⁸ Burton also claims the hyacinth and topaz "allay anger, grief, diminish madness, much delight and exhilarate the mind."¹⁰⁹

Feste also alludes to Malvolio's possession by devils when he reads aloud the steward's letter to his mistress.

Cl. Truly Madam, he holds Belzebub at the staves and as well as a man in his case may do: has heere writ a letter to you, I should have given't you to day morning. But as a madmans Epistles are no Gospels, so it skillles not much when they are deliver'd.

Ol. Open't, and read it.

Clo. Looke then to be well edified, when the Foole delivers the Madman. By the Lord Madam.

Ol. How now, art thou mad?

Clo. No Madam, I do but reade madnesse: and your Ladyship will have it as it ought to bee, you must allow
Vox.¹¹⁰

The letter proves to be Malvolio's salvation, for Orsino after hearing it declares, "This savours not much of distraction,"¹¹¹ and Olivia is of the same opinion. Both, however, refer to the steward as a madman when he appears, and Malvolio commences a tirade against Olivia since he believes she

suffer'd me to be imprison'd,
Kept in a darke house, visited by the Priest.¹¹²

Malvolio's supposed madness is essential to the subplot, and, were all the allusions to madness restricted to him, they would be understandable for that reason. But almost every other important character in the play is linked with madness. Olivia, for example, upon learning that her uncle Toby is detaining a messenger at the gate, sends Maria to rescue the stranger; Toby, she explains, "speakes nothing but madman."¹¹³ Olivia and Feste make very clear the nature of Toby's madness:

Ol. What's a drunken man like, foole?

Clo. Like a drown'd man, a foole, and a madde man: One draught above heate, makes him a foole, the second maddes him, and a third drownes him.

Ol. Go thou and seeke the Crowner, and let him sitte o'my Coz: for he's in the third degree of drinke: hee's drown'd: go looke after him.

Clo. He is but mad yet Madona, and the foole shall
looke to the madman.¹¹⁴

The final line may imply that there is not very much difference between fools and madmen, a suggestion that is supported much later in the play when Feste teases Malvolio:

Mall. Foole, there was never man so notoriouslie
abus'd: I am as well in my wits (foole) as thou art.

Clo. But as well: then you are mad indeede, if you be
no better in your wits then a foole.¹¹⁵

Toby's madness is caused by drink; the fool's, however, is a necessary adjunct to his profession.

Antonio alludes to madness by possession when he explains to Orsino the circumstances which brought him to Illyria:

A witchcraft drew me hither:
That most ingratefull boy there by your side,
From the rude seas enrag'd and foamy mouth
Did I redeeme: a wracke past hope he was:
His life I gave him, and did thereto adde
My love without retention, or restraint,
All his in dedication. For his sake,
Did I expose my selfe (pure for his love)
Into the danger of this adverse Towne.¹¹⁶

The duke, as baffled as Antonio, says to him, "fellow thy words are
madnesse."¹¹⁷ At his arrest Antonio similarly suggests that he has
been victimized by his worship of the devil, the "witchcraft" mentioned above. To the arresting officers he complains of Sebastian's
ingratitude:

This youth that you see heere,
I snatch'd one halfe out of the jaws of death,
Releev'd him with such sanctitie of love;
And to his image, which me thought did promise
Most venerable worth, did I devotion.¹¹⁸

Uninterested in his complaint, the officers try to hustle him away,
but Antonio continues the metaphor:

But oh, how vilde an idoll proves this God:
 Thou hast Sebastian done good feature, shame.
 In Nature, there's no blemish but the minde:
 None can be call'd deform'd, but the unkinde.
 Vertue is beauty, but the beauteous evill
 Are empty trunkes, ore-flourish'd by the devill.¹¹⁹

The officers cannot comprehend the rather elaborate plaint made by their prisoner, and one says to the other, ironically anticipating Orsino's judgment, "The man growes mad."¹²⁰

Sebastian, confused by what befalls him, questions his sanity and the sanity of those around him. Struck by Andrew, he returns the blow with interest, perplexedly crying out, "Are all the people mad?"¹²¹ A few lines later Olivia, enraged at the treatment the person she assumes is Cesario has received from her uncle, issues a heartfelt apology to Sebastian, who amazedly wonders aloud:

What rellish is in this? How runs the streame?
 Or I am mad, or else this is a dreame.¹²²

Again, as he awaits Olivia and the priest who is to marry them, Sebastian questions his sanity:

This is the ayre, that is the glorious Sunne,
 This pearl she gave me, I do feel't, and see't,
 And though tis wonder that enwraps me thus,
 Yet 'tis not madness. Where's Antonio then,

 His counsell now might do me golden service,
 For though my soule disputes well with my sence,
 That this may be some error, but no madnesse,
 Yet doth this accident and flood of Fortune,
 So farre exceed all instance, all discourse,
 That I am reddie to distrust mine eyes,
 And wrangle with my reason that perswades me
 To any other trust, but that I am mad,
 Or else the Ladies mad; yet if 'twere so,
 She could not sway her house, command her followers,
 Take, and give back affayres, and their dispatch,
 With such a smooth, discreet, and stable bearing
 As I perceive she do's: there's something in't
 That is deceivable.¹²³

It is evident that Sebastian is supposed to feel that the circumstances

which have transpired can only be explained by lunacy. Either he or Olivia is mad.

The madness which afflicts Malvolio and Antonio, and baffles Sebastian, is caused by love. In commenting on the treatment for madness proposed by Toby, incarceration in a dark room and whipping, Furness reminds us to compare that proposal with similar lines in As You Like It; Rosalind says,

Love is meereley a madnesse, and I tel you, deserves as wel a darke house, and a whip, as madmen do: and the reason why they are not so punish'd and cured, is that the Lunacie is so ordinarie, that the whippers are in love too.¹²⁴

Her comment applies to Twelfth Night: Malvolio is afflicted with self love, Antonio with love for his young friend Sebastian, while Viola, Olivia, and Orsino are involved in a love triangle.

Of the love triangle, Olivia's behavior best exemplifies the madness that is love. Sebastian is puzzled by Olivia's treatment of him, puzzled only because he is unaware that she has fallen in love with his sister, disguised as the page Cesario. Olivia's love, of course, provides the basic complication of the play. She herself suggests that love is a madness when she first grants the fateful interview to Viola. The duke's ambassador requests that the countess listen to her message, but Olivia, refusing, says,

I pray you keep it in. I heard you were sawcy at my gates, & allowd your approach rather to wonder at you, then to heare you. If you be not mad, be gone: if you have reason, be breefe: 'tis not that time of Moone with me, to make one in so skipping a dialogue.¹²⁵

She implies that Viola is mad. Her mention of the moon suggests its supposed influence on sanity, and her use of "skipping," defined by Johnson as "wild, frolic, mad,"¹²⁶ indicates that she thinks any talk of love is an exhibition of insanity.

But Olivia is to bear out Rosalind's remark about the whippers who are themselves afflicted by love. Scorning the duke, she immediately afterward discovers that she is madly in love with Cesario, so much so that both she and her servants easily diagnose her malady. After meeting Cesario, she says

How now?
Even so quickly may one catch the plague?
Me thinks I feele this youths perfections
With an invisible, and subtle stealth
To creepe in at mine eyes.¹²⁷

In his discussion of the role of beauty as a cause of love madness, Burton cites Ficinus, who said "the beginning of this disease, 'love,' is the eye."¹²⁸ Maria tells Toby that their plan to gull Malvolio cannot help succeeding, for his behavior will be intolerable to Olivia since she is presently "addicted to a melancholly."¹²⁹ When she sends Maria to summon Malvolio after hearing of his strange behavior, Olivia further suggests that she is mad:

I am as madde as hee,
If sad and merry madnesse equall bee.¹³⁰

Since Malvolio has just been described as doing "nothing but smile,"¹³¹ his is the "merry madnesse" and Olivia's the "sad."

Olivia is somewhat aware of the relationship between love and madness. She is willing enough to describe herself as mad when excusing her failure to rescue Malvolio from his tormentors:

A most extracting frensie of mine owne
From my remembrance, clearly banisht his.¹³²

Thus, the irony of a line in Malvolio's letter would not have escaped her; he writes that he has "the benefit of my senses as well as your Ladieship."¹³³ Malvolio does not have the benefit of his senses because he is madly in love with himself; and his mistress, in love with Cesario, is as mad as he.

However, the irony escapes Duke Orsino, for he is also love-mad. He recognizes his own conduct as abnormal:

For such as I am, all true Lovers are,
Unstaid and skittish in all motions else,
Save in the constant image of the creature
That is below'd.¹³⁴

Feste, on the other hand, is more blunt in his assessment. Having sung melancholy songs so that the duke could sorrowfully wallow in the slough of sentimental love, the clown upon his leave-taking sums up his feelings about his condition: "Now the melancholly God protect thee, and the Tailor make thy doublet of changeable Taffata, for thy minde is a very Opall."¹³⁵ The opal suggests that Orsino's mind, like the gem, is clouded; or, perhaps, that his love for Olivia has deprived him of his senses, for the gem had the reputed quality of causing "a maner blindesse, that is called Amentia, so that . . . [whoever looked upon it] may not see neither take heede what is done before their eyen."¹³⁶ Burton notes that one scholar was asked in his doctoral examination "whether amantes (lovers) and amentes (mad men) be cured by the same remedies."¹³⁷ The answer was affirmative. This image of the opal gives added meaning to Orsino's command that Cesario go again to Olivia and

Tell her my love, more noble then the world
Prizes not quantitie of dirtie lands,
The parts that fortune hath bestow'd upon her:
Tell her I hold as giddily as Fortune:
But 'tis that miracle, and Queene of Jems
That nature pranks her in, attracts my soule.¹³⁸

These lines oppose the gifts of fortune, wealth and property, to those of nature, personal qualities; but Orsino's reference to the "Queene of Jems," made so soon after Feste has suggested the particular gem responsible for his state of mind, emphasizes the clown's

judgment. Further evidence of the duke's deluded state of mind is his claim that

There is no womans sides
Can bide the beating of so strong a passion,
As love doth give my heart: no womans heart
So bigge, to hold so much, they lacke retention.
Alas, their love may be call'd appetite,
No motion of the Liver, but the Pallat,
That suffer surfet, cloyment, and revolt,
But mine is all as hungry as the Sea,
And can digest as much.¹³⁹

Orsino, in implying the source of his love is the liver, acknowledges his madness, for that organ was commonly believed to produce the humour which, if not discharged from the body, ultimately caused insanity.¹⁴⁰ This alimentary image, again associating love and sickness, is uttered in the presence of Viola, a living contradiction of Orsino's bombastic claim. Viola and the audience are aware of the irrationality of the duke, an irrationality which he confirms by his conduct when he learns that his page has married Olivia.

Finally, Viola, in love with Orsino, is twice referred to as mad. The most inconspicuous instance occurs when she first meets Olivia, who tells her, "If you be not mad, be gone."¹⁴¹ She does not go, thereby forcing the conclusion that she is mad, a conclusion which might as easily have been deduced by observing her willingness to sacrifice her desires for Orsino's. Answering the duke's claim that he loves more passionately than any woman, she admits her madness. Disguised as Cesario, she refutes his contention by telling about the silent love of an imagined sister, who

pin'd in thought,
And with a greene and yellow melancholly,
She sate like Patience on a Monument,
Smiling at greefe.¹⁴²

Burton points out that pining away and the green-sickness, Viola's "greene and yellow melancholly," are symptoms of love melancholy.¹⁴³ She, like the other members of the triangle, is love-mad.

Burton notes that among the causes of love, and therefore love melancholy, is music, an art prominent in the play.¹⁴⁴ Indeed, the very first line, Orsino's oft quoted, "If Musicke be the food of Love, play on,"¹⁴⁵ suggests his recognition of this fact. But music not only causes love, it also "is a sovereign remedy against Despair and Melancholy,"¹⁴⁶ and the duke also acknowledges this truth with his comment on the effects of a surfeit of music.

These characteristics of music make plausible Viola's plan to be taken into the duke's household because she

can sing,
And speake to him in many sorts of Musicke,
That will allow me very worth his service.¹⁴⁷

Later, Orsino does select his page as his emissary to Olivia because the youth can sing; Cesario's voice, his

small pipe
Is as the maidens organ, shrill, and sound,¹⁴⁸

a fitting instrument to awaken love in Olivia's heart.

Viola's attitude toward music and love are very much the same as Orsino's. Asked by Olivia what she would do if she were a spurned lover, Viola replies that, among other things, she would

Write loyall Cantons of contemned love,
And sing them lowd even in the dead of night.¹⁴⁹

Viola also concurs with his announced feelings about the curative effects of music. In his first appearance in the second act Orsino echoes the lines which begin the play:

Give me some Musick; Now good morrow frends.
 Now good Cesario, but that peece of song,
 That old and Anticke song we heard last night;
 Me thought it did releeeve my passion much,
 More then light ayres, and recollected termes
 Of these most briske and giddy-paced times.
 Come, but one verse.¹⁵⁰

Informed that Feste, the previous night's singer, is not present,
 he says, "Seeke him out, and play the tune the while."¹⁵¹ As the
 music begins, the duke turns to Cesario:

Come hither Boy, if ever thou shalt love
 In the sweet pangs of it, remember me:
 For such as I am, all true Lovers are,
 Unstaid and skittish in all motions else,
 Save in the constant image of the creature
 That is belov'd. How dost thou like this tune?¹⁵²

The lovesick maiden can only say,

It gives a verie eccho to the seate
 Where love is thron'd.¹⁵³

Olivia also associates music with love by using it as a meta-
 phor for courtship. When Viola arrives on her second mission from
 Orsino, Olivia says:

O by your leave I pray you.
 I bad you never speake againe of him;
 But would you undertake another suite
 I had rather heare you, to solicit that
 Then Musicke from the spheares.¹⁵⁴

Her invitation to Viola is in direct contrast with her words to Orsino.
 In the last act she sweeps into his court, and, before he has a chance
 to address her, she stops him by saying that if his words

be ought to the old tune my Lord,
 It is as fat and fulsome to mine eare
 As howling after Musicke.¹⁵⁵

To her, words of love are sublime music or terrible racket depending
 upon the person speaking.

One love song Feste sings for Orsino has vexed many of the commentators. Called a "wailing dirge" by Furness, it possibly does seem inappropriate to the clown's character.

Come away, come away death,
 And in sad cypresse let me be laide.
 Fye away, fie away breath,
 I am slaine by a faire cruell maide:
 My shrowd of white, stuck all with Ew, O prepare it.
 My part of death no one so true did share it.

Not a flower, not a flower sweete
 On my blacke coffin, let there be strewne:
 Not a friend, not a friend greet
 My poore corpes, where my bones shall be throwne:
 A thousand thousand sighes to save, lay me O where
 Sad true lover never find my grave, to weepe there.¹⁵⁶

Some critics claim Viola is supposed to be the singer, particularly since her talents for music have several times been mentioned. Furness, however, believes the chief function of the song is to give credence to Feste's versatility as a performer, especially since he is to imitate a priest later in the play.¹⁵⁷ In any event, in light of the relationship between music and melancholy, the words are highly appropriate. They express the extremity of emotion felt by the melancholy Orsino and Viola, and may have been meant gently to satirize their lovesickness. Such satire is a possibility, for there is no reason to assume that the clown's delivery of the song reflected the mood of its words. The simple incongruity presented by a clown in motley mouthing these sentiments with two mooning lovers in the background would in itself be risible. Any stage business, of course, could heighten the comedy. The song contrasts with the mood of the scene in which it appears, for both before and after the song Orsino jokes with Feste, but the clown's exit lines indicate Orsino's attitude may have changed during the song:

Now the melancholly God protect thee, and the Tailor make
thy doublet of changeable Taffata, for thy minde is a very
Opall. I would have men of such constancie put to Sea, that
their businesse might be every thing, and their intent
everiewhere, for that's it that alwayes makes a good voyage
of nothing.¹⁵⁸

The "melancholly God" is, of course, Cupid, for Feste correctly
diagnoses the duke's malady.

A subject of much greater importance than music in the Anatomy
of Melancholy is religion, and understandably so, for Burton was a
churchman. Indeed, he treated religious melancholy as one of the
divisions of love melancholy. But in Romeo and Juliet we saw the
metaphorical treatment of love as religion, and in Twelfth Night the
same metaphor, amplified by the context of madness, recurs.

As was the case in Romeo and Juliet, the beloved is referred
to as a deity. Twice in the last act Orsino makes such a comparison.
Upon the entrance of Olivia he says, "Heere comes the Countesse, now
heaven walkes on earth."¹⁵⁹ She discourages his attempts at love
making and he again employs the metaphor to upbraid her:

you uncivill Ladie
To whose ingrate, and unauspicious Altars
My soule the faithfull'st offrings have breath'd out
That ere devotion tender'd.¹⁶⁰

The precedent for the association of Olivia with religion takes place
early in the first act when Valentine returns from an unsuccessful
attempt to interview her and reports to the duke that she plans to
mourn seven years for her dead brother, during which time "like a
Cloystresse she will vailed walk."¹⁶¹

Another outstanding passage developing the association between
religion and love comprises part of the dialogue between Viola and
Olivia at their first meeting.

Ol. What are you? What would you?

Vio. What I am, and what I would, are as secret as maiden-head: to your eares Divinity; to any others, prophanation.

Ol. Give us the place alone, we will hear this divinity. Now, sir, what is your text?

Vio. Most sweet Ladie.

Ol. A comfortable doctrine, and much may bee saide of it. Where lies your Text?

Vio. In Orsinoes bosome.

Ol. In his bosome? In what chapter of his bosome?

Vio. To answer by the method, in the first of his hart.

Ol. O, I have read it: it is heresie. Have you no more to say?

Vio. Good Madam, let me see your face.

Ol. Have you any Commission from your Lord, to negotiate with my face: you are now out of your Text.¹⁶²

In this exchange Olivia catechizes Viola, and she responds with an adeptness that demonstrates her recognition of the game Olivia is playing, a game the countess has earlier played with Feste.¹⁶³ She, of course, has herself suggested the idea to Olivia by telling her that the message from the duke is divine. Olivia's statement about Viola's being "out" of her "Text" signals the end of the catechism, and the two continue their discussion using another metaphor. The passage is very reminiscent of Romeo and Juliet's first meeting, and, as in that scene, one objective of the exchange of wit is to demonstrate the quick intelligence of two who would, if their sexes permitted, be very typical of Shakespearian lovers. That both are women transforms the sublime into the ridiculous. But the passage also makes clear the similarity in the relationship between lover and beloved and worshiper and God.

• Religious imagery is also employed to describe friendship, itself a kind of love. Antonio, disappointed because the person he believes to be Sebastian refuses to return his money, says,

Let me speake a little. This youth that you see heere,
I snatch'd one halfe out of the jawes of death,
Releev'd him with such sanctitie of love;
And to his image, which methought did promise
Most venerable worth, did I devotion.¹⁶⁴

The last three lines suggest love as a form of worship, and the use of the metaphor strengthens the sense of betrayal, and the anguish, which Antonio feels. The lines go beyond worship to the consequences of worshiping an "image"; for, not only does that word express Antonio's contempt for Sebastian, in its context it clearly refers to the second commandment.

Olivia, too, recognizes the possibility that her love for Cesario may have similar undesirable consequences: "A Fiend like thee might beare my soule to hell," she says to him.¹⁶⁵ She nevertheless plans to worship at Cesario's altar, a decision which is almost her undoing.

Love itself may sometimes be a deity. As Orsino's page, Viola on her first visit to Olivia curses her: "Love make his heart of flint, that you shal love."¹⁶⁶ This curse does not go unheard.

Although religious imagery is not restricted to members of the love triangle, references made by other characters contribute little. Only once is it used by any of the minor characters to allude to love, and that reference is made by Maria about the "Puritan," Malvolio, who is "so cram'd (as he thinkes) with excellencies, that it is his grounds of faith, that all that looke on

him, love him."¹⁶⁷ Malvolio, of course, is in love with himself, and, while Maria's allusion is to his mistaken belief that all share his high opinion of himself, many in the audience would have also understood her to be criticizing his religious beliefs.

Similarly critical of the misuse of religion, but in no way connected with love, is Feste's comment as he prepares himself for the role of Sir Topas; donning a cassock, he says,

Well, Ile put it on, and I will dissemble my selfe in't,
and I would I were the first that ever dissembled in such
a gowne. I am not tall enough to become the function well,
nor leane enough to bee thought a good Student.¹⁶⁸

Other than the topical allusion, his remark does little more than add to the quantity of religious imagery in the play, just as Toby's assurance to Andrew that the duel the knight is to engage in will "end without the perdition of soules,"¹⁶⁹ and Fabian's attempt to bolster Andrew's courage by claiming his opponent to be "a Coward, a most devout Coward, religious in it."¹⁷⁰

As in Romeo and Juliet and As You Like It, and for that matter Apolonius and Silla, there are a rather large number of images relating to wealth and to value. Many of these are probably nothing more than conventional uses of a comparison both meaningful and convenient. For example, Feste tells Malvolio that Toby declines to bet even "two pence that you are no Foole."¹⁷¹

But such uses of the imagery of wealth and value are not characteristic of the play, for in Twelfth Night that which is materially valuable--money, jewels, precious metals, or whatever--is not typically used as a criterion of value. Instead, a majority of instances show whatever is materially valuable employed as an

instrument of exchange. In a noticeable number of examples the characters pay, repay, or give, in the hope that the gift will purchase favor.

Those who give gifts usually expect love in return. Orsino sends his page to Olivia with a jewel.¹⁷² Olivia, in love with Cesario, sends him a ring after their first meeting,¹⁷³ and during the course of their second confrontation gives him a jeweled locket.¹⁷⁴ To Maria, she candidly reveals her motive for giving:

I have sent after him, he sayes hee'l come:
How shall I feast him? What bestow of him?
For youth is bought more oft, then begg'd, or borrow'd.¹⁷⁵

Sebastian also receives valuable gifts. His friend Antonio gives him money,¹⁷⁶ and Olivia, thinking he is Cesario, gives him a pearl.¹⁷⁷ These gifts are not made in vain.

The recognition and establishment of value are also demonstrated by an exchange that takes place between Orsino and Feste. The clown explains how he is the worse for his friends who "praise me, and make an asse of me, now my foes tell me plainly, I am an Asse: so that by my foes sir, I profit in the knowledge of my selfe."¹⁷⁸ Once begun, the allusions to value continue:

Du. Thou shalt not be the worse for me, there's gold.

Clo. But that it would be double dealing sir, I would you could make it another.

Du. O you give me ill counsell.

Clo. Put your grace in your pocket sir, for this once, and let your flesh and blood obey it.

Du. Well, I will be so much a sinner to be a double dealer: there's another.

Clo. Primo, secundo, tertio, is a good play, and the olde saying is, the third payes for all: the triplex sir, is a good tripping measure, or the belles of S. Bennet sir, may put you in minde, one, two, three.

Du. You can foole no more money out of mee at this throw: if you will let your Lady know I am here to speak with her, and bring her along with you, it may awake my bounty further.

Clo. Marry sir, lullaby to your bountie till I come agen. I go sir, but I would not have you to thinke, that my desire of having is the sinne of covetousnesse: but as you say sir, let your bounty take a nappe, I will awake it anon.¹⁷⁹

The word play in this passage includes several other areas of imagery, most noticeably religion, yet the overall effect is to establish the distinction between generosity and prodigality. Feste's wit has value, but the duke must not be excessive in his payment, lest he be an even greater fool than the clown.

This dialogue is only a single example of the fact that the question of proper recompense is one of the major concerns of the play. Feste figures in one such instance when he refuses to permit Fabian to see a letter he is delivering:

Fab. Now as thou lov'st me, let me see his Letter.

Clo. Good M. Fabian, grant me another request.

Fab. Any thing.

Clo. Do not desire to see this Letter.

Fab. This is to give a dogge, and in recompense desire my dogge againe.¹⁸⁰

One commentator has pointed out a possible source for this:

In Manningham's Diary, on March 26, 1602/3, two days after the queen's death, occurs the following: "Mr. Francis Curle told me howe one Dr Bullein, the Queenes kinsman, had a dog which he doted one, soe muche that the Queene understanding of it requested he would graunt hir one desyre, and he should have what soever he would aske. Shee demaunded his dogge; he gave it, and 'Nowe, Madame,' quoth he, 'you promised to give me my desyre.' 'I will,' quoth she. 'Then I pray you give me my dog againe.'"¹⁸¹

Certainly, this amusing explanation makes the passage much clearer, but, more importantly, Fabian and Feste are engaged in a situation

dependent upon the idea of payment, one in which Fabian recognizes too late the trap set for him by the clown.

Recompense can equate to revenge in the play. Antonio speaks of the wars between his city and Illyria in which he

did some service, of such note indeede,
That were I tane heere, it would scarce be answer'd.¹⁸²

He explains that he still is in debt for his service against the duke's city because even though the matter

might have since bene answer'd in repaying
What we tooke from them, which for Traffiques sake
Most of our City did. Onely my selfe stood out,
For which if I be lapsed in this place
I shall pay deere.¹⁸³

Antonio acknowledges what everyone knows; revenge is repayment.

The most significant use of the metaphor of repayment is the recurring concept of love as debt. Early in the play, for example, Orsino rhapsodizes about the happiness due the man who finally wins Olivia's heart:

O she that hath a heart of that fine frame
To pay this debt of love but to a brother,
How will she love, when the rich golden shaft
Hath kill'd the flocke of all affections else
That live in her.¹⁸⁴

The duke, of course, is not aware that Olivia's announced plan to spend seven years mourning for her brother is simply a ruse to discourage his suit. Orsino's "debt of love" is echoed by Viola, Olivia, and Sebastian. Being offered a gratuity by Olivia after their first meeting, Viola, disguised as the duke's page, refuses it:

I am no feede poast, Lady; keepe your purse
My master, not my selfe, lacks recompence.¹⁸⁵

Sebastian describes another form of love, friendship, as a debt when he attempts to convince Antonio that they should part company:

"I shall crave of you your leave, that I may beare my evils alone. It were a bad recompence for your love, to lay any of them on you."¹⁸⁶ Although few in number, these instances employing the metaphor of debt signal an attitude toward love not present in the other plays examined.

In Romeo and Juliet and As You Like It, the wealth imagery is largely quantitative. Juliet

hangs upon the cheeke of night:
As a rich Jewel in an Ethiops eare,
Bewtie too rich for use, for earth too dear.¹⁸⁷

and Rosalind finds verses on a tree which declare

From the east to westerne Inde,
no jewel is like Rosalinde.¹⁸⁸

However, the wealth imagery in Twelfth Night concentrates on the metaphor of exchange. In that, Twelfth Night resembles its source, for Apolonius and Silla is similarly concerned with the exchange of love and honor.

This distinction between the measuring function and the exchange function of wealth was probably made by many who saw the play. Sir Robert Cotton in a speech before the Privy Council in 1626 praised Queen Elizabeth for reestablishing the purity and weight of the English coinage. She followed the advice of Lord Treasurer Burleigh and Sir Thomas Smith

and began to reduce the Monies to their elder goodness, stiling that Work in her first Proclamation Anno 3. A Famous Act. The next Year following, having perfected it as it after stood; she tells her People by another Edict, that she had conquered now that Monster that had so long devoured them, meaning the Variation of the Standard.¹⁸⁹

Cotton distinguishes the two functions of gold and silver by pointing out their use as money, "the Princes Measures given to his people"

or as "Commodities, valuing each other according to the plenty or scarcity; and so all other Commodities by them."¹⁹⁰ The idea of money as a standard measure was so important that, in 1573, Burleigh told some who suggested debasing the coinage that "they were worthy to suffer Death for attempting to put so great a Dishonour on the Queen, and Detriment and Discontent upon the People."¹⁹¹ Cotton's understanding of the use of gold and silver as commodities of exchange was for his time highly sophisticated; he saw what was for him a basic fact: "All Commodities are prized by plenty or scarcity, by dearness or cheapness, the one by the other."¹⁹² And he also claimed that the only way to increase the value of a nation's money was through a favorable balance of trade; as he says,

buy we in more than we sell of other Commodities, be the Money never so high prized, we must part with it to make the disproportion even: If we sell more than we buy, the contrary will follow.¹⁹³

Compared to Cotton's then acute analysis of the role of money in England's economy, Shakespeare's use of the imagery of wealth to measure the value of the beloved in Romeo and Juliet and As You Like It is remarkably simple. His use of it to suggest the exchange of love in Twelfth Night is similarly uncomplicated. Sir Robert Cotton, seven years younger than Shakespeare, doubtless was aware of the playwright's attempts to utilize the imagery of wealth in his plays. Unfortunately, neither he nor any of his contemporaries who shared his interest in economics commented on the plays.

Not only is the language concerned with insanity used to describe the particular malady that afflicts most of the play's characters, it also helps to link together other major areas of

imagery in the play. The topaz and opal, for example, recall the extensive imagery of wealth and value. Similarly, religion and madness are associated, most noticeably by the burlesque casting out of devils inflicted upon Malvolio.

Like Rich in Apolonius and Silla, Shakespeare is concerned with the general subject of love in Twelfth Night. It seems quite possible that Shakespeare's understanding of Rich's tale encompassed the latter's use of the metaphors of sickness and value, particularly since the playwright employed very much the same metaphors in his own play. This adoption of the source's imagery is especially surprising considering Shakespeare's practice in Romeo and Juliet and As You Like It.

Despite this similarity, the source and the play are more different than alike, for Shakespeare is more explicit than Rich in the matter of the malady which afflicts his characters. At the same time, he is less specific about the morality of the characters' actions. To Rich, love was a sickness that was apt to plague anybody, but the individual was not entirely defenseless so long as he conducted himself rationally. Shakespeare, on the other hand, demonstrates that love is insanity, and is therefore beyond the powers of reason, although reason can mitigate the consequences of love. The person who is in love is much like an animal, which may help to explain the animal imagery of the play. Because morality is a product of reason, the conduct of those who are not controlled by their reason can hardly demonstrate any moral stance.

• Twelfth Night functions to present a comprehensive survey of the varieties of love, with each of the major characters

displaying a single kind. Malvolio is the lover of the self; Antonio's actions exemplify that variety of love known as friendship; Olivia, as her counterpart does in Rich's tale, indiscreetly falls in love with appearance; Orsino is the idealistic, chivalrous lover who has set the woman he loves on a pedestal; and Viola is the secret lover willing to suffer any indignity in order to be near her beloved. Insofar as the conduct of each is guided by his passion rather than his reason, each can be said to be mad. Because of the universality of the affliction, Shakespeare does not make his Olivia into the bad example that Rich does his Julina. The playwright avoids the potentially tragic situation of the tale by having Olivia marry Sebastian before she can possibly compromise herself. Nevertheless, Olivia's fate, like Julina's, is due to circumstance; the play ends happily for her, in spite of, rather than because of, her actions.

By contrast, Viola, because of her faithfulness and constancy, is rewarded with the love of Orsino. He at last understands the value of the love tendered him by Viola and gives her his love in exchange, an action underlined by the use of imagery of wealth in the play. Love is revealed to be, at its best, a reciprocal relationship, an exchange, between two people which ultimately depends on internal qualities rather than outward appearance. The contrast between Viola and Olivia has helped Orsino, and, if they did not know it, the audience to learn this important lesson.

The play ends as a celebration of love in which only one voice is raised in unhappiness. Antonio is reconciled to Sebastian, and the lovers are paired, including even Maria and Toby. Malvolio,

however, angrily storms off stage, swearing an unlikely revenge. In this way, perhaps, Shakespeare suggests that there is only one kind of love finally and incontrovertibly reprehensible: the love which is directed inward. All but Malvolio are more or less cured of their passion; he rages on.

To summarize, then, Rich would have us believe the passions can be controlled by the reason. Shakespeare's imitation of Apolonius and Silla demonstrates that passion is beyond the full control of the reason although one's conduct, even when in the grip of love, is partially subject to rational control. Shakespeare follows Rich very closely insofar as the Viola-Orsino-Olivia plot is concerned and remarkably closely insofar as metaphor itself is concerned. However, a close examination of the imagery of the source and the play reveals that each work is involved in presenting ideas concerning the nature of love which, if not diametrically opposed, are quite different. Thus, once again, Shakespeare succeeded in attaining originality through imitation.

NOTES

1. Barnabe Rich, Rich's Farewell to Military Profession, 1581, ed. Thomas Mabry Cranfill (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1959), pp. xxxvii-xlvi.
2. Ibid., p. liv.
3. Ibid., pp. 3-6.
4. Ibid., p. 7.
5. Ibid., pp. 7-8.
6. Ibid., p. 9.
7. Ibid., p. 10.
8. Ibid., pp. 12-14.
9. Ibid., p. 12.
10. Ibid., pp. 15-16.
11. Ibid., p. 16.
12. Ibid., p. 17.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid., p. 19.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid., p. 76.
17. Ibid., p. 85.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid., p. 70.
20. Ibid., p. 74.
21. Ibid., p. 71.

22. Ibid.
23. Ibid., p. 74.
24. Ibid., pp. 83-84.
25. Ibid., p. 84.
26. Ibid., p. 87.
27. Ibid., p. 77.
28. Ibid., p. 67.
29. Ibid., p. 268.
30. Ibid., p. 84.
31. Ibid., p. 69.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid., p. 77.
35. Ibid.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid.
38. Ibid., p. 84.
39. Ibid., p. 78.
40. Ibid., p. 80.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid., p. 82.
43. Ibid., p. 76. For "ccept" Cranfill suggests "concept," ibid.,
p. 272.
44. Ibid., p. 78.
45. Ibid., p. 80.
46. Ibid., p. 85.
47. Ibid., p. 67.

48. Ibid., p. 66.
49. Ibid.
50. Ibid., p. 75.
51. William Shakespeare, A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare, Vol. XIII: Twelve Night, or What You Will, ed. Horace Howard Furness (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1901), p. 327. This work is hereafter referred to as Variorum.
52. Kenneth Muir, Shakespeare's Sources, Vol. I: Comedies and Tragedies (London: Methuen & Company, Ltd, 1961), p. 70.
53. Ibid., p. 71.
54. Ibid., p. 73.
55. William Shakespeare, Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies, A Facsimile Edition Prepared by Helge Kökeritz (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954), p. 265. This work is hereafter referred to as Facsimile.
56. Ibid., p. 267.
57. Ibid., p. 263.
58. Muir, p. 73.
59. Caroline F.E. Spurgeon, Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935), p. 268.
60. Ibid., pp. 268-269.
61. Ibid., p. 269.
62. Variorum, p. xii.
63. Facsimile, p. 259.
64. Ibid., p. 268.
65. Ibid., p. 270.
66. Variorum, p. 254.
67. Facsimile, p. 260.
68. Variorum, p. 108.
69. Facsimile, p. 263.
70. Variorum, pp. 150-151.

71. Facsimile, p. 259.
72. Ibid., p. 257.
73. Variorum, p. 48.
74. Facsimile, p. 266.
75. Variorum, pp. 205-206.
76. Facsimile, p. 267.
77. Ibid.
78. Ibid., p. 265.
79. Variorum, p. 187.
80. Facsimile, p. 265.
81. Ibid.
82. Ibid., p. 269.
83. Ibid., p. 273.
84. Ibid., p. 263.
85. Ibid., p. 255.
86. Ibid.
87. Ibid., p. 270.
88. Ibid., p. 263.
89. Ibid., p. 265.
90. Ibid., p. 256.
91. Ibid., p. 258.
92. Ibid., p. 261.
93. Ibid., p. 260.
94. Ibid., p. 255.
95. Ibid., p. 259.
96. Ibid., p. 258.
97. Robert Burton, The Anatomy of Melancholy, ed. Floyd Dell and Paul Jordan-Smith (New York: Tudor Publishing Company, 1941), pp. 252-259.

98. Facsimile, p. 267.
99. Ibid.
100. Variorum, p. 220.
101. Burton, p. 99.
102. Burton devotes a subsection of his Anatomy to the consideration of whether and how possession by devils is a cause of madness. R. R. Reed states that The Yorkshire Tragedy "provides substantial evidence that, where natural causes were not apparent, the medieval idea of diabolical possession was still considered a major cause of insanity" (Robert Rentoul Reed, Jr., Bedlam on the Jacobean Stage [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952], p. 106).
103. Facsimile, p. 268.
104. Ibid.
105. Variorum, pp. 224-225.
106. R. R. Reed cites evidence drawn from Dekker and Massinger, as well as Shakespeare, which shows that incarcerating the insane patient in a dark room was standard treatment (Reed, pp. 24-25, 36).
107. Facsimile, p. 268.
108. Variorum, p. 258.
109. Burton, p. 567.
110. Facsimile, p. 274.
111. Ibid.
112. Ibid., p. 275.
113. Ibid., p. 258.
114. Ibid.
115. Ibid., p. 271.
116. Ibid., p. 272.
117. Ibid., p. 273.
118. Ibid., p. 270.
119. Ibid.

120. Ibid., p. 405.
121. Ibid., p. 270.
122. Ibid.
123. Ibid., p. 271.
124. Variorum, p. 227n.
125. Facsimile, p. 259.
126. Variorum, p. 82.
127. Facsimile, p. 259.
128. Burton, p. 681.
129. Facsimile, p. 264.
130. Ibid., p. 267.
131. Ibid.
132. Ibid., p. 274.
133. Ibid.
134. Ibid., p. 262.
135. Ibid.
136. Quoted from Batman uppon Bartholome, De Proprietatibus Rerum (1582) in Variorum, p. 145.
137. Burton, p. 769.
138. Facsimile, p. 262.
139. Ibid., p. 263.
140. Reed, pp. 66-74.
141. Facsimile, p. 259.
142. Ibid., p. 263.
143. Burton, p. 721.
144. Ibid., pp. 699-700.
145. Facsimile, p. 255.

146. Burton, p. 479.
147. Facsimile, p. 256.
148. Ibid., p. 257.
149. Ibid., p. 259.
150. Ibid., p. 262.
151. Ibid.
152. Ibid.
153. Ibid.
154. Ibid., p. 265.
155. Ibid., p. 273.
156. Ibid., p. 262.
157. Variorum, pp. 142-143.
158. Facsimile, p. 262.
159. Ibid., p. 273.
160. Ibid.
161. Ibid., p. 255.
162. Ibid., p. 259.
163. Ibid., p. 258.
164. Ibid., p. 270.
165. Ibid., p. 268.
166. Ibid., p. 259.
167. Ibid., p. 261.
168. Ibid., p. 271.
169. Ibid., p. 269.
170. Ibid., p. 270.
171. Ibid., p. 258.
172. Ibid., p. 263.

173. Ibid., p. 259.
174. Ibid., p. 268.
175. Ibid., p. 267.
176. Ibid.
177. Ibid., p. 271.
178. Ibid., p. 272.
179. Ibid.
180. Ibid.
181. Variorum, p. 278.
182. Facsimile, p. 267.
183. Ibid.
184. Ibid., p. 255.
185. Ibid., p. 259.
186. Ibid., p. 260.
187. William Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet, Second Quarto, 1599, Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles No. 6, ed. W. W. Greg (London: The Shakespeare Association and Sidgwick and Jackson, Ltd, 1949), I.v.48-49.
188. Facsimile, p. 195.
189. Robert Cotton, "A Speech Made by Sir Robert Cotton Touching the Alteration in Coin," Old and Scarce Tracts on Money (London: P. S. King & Son, Ltd, 1933), p. 126.
190. Ibid., p. 138.
191. Ibid.
192. Ibid., p. 139.
193. Ibid., pp. 139-140.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ascham, Roger. English Works. Edited by William Aldis Wright.
Cambridge: The University Press, 1904.
- Baldwin, Charles Sears. Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice.
Edited by Donald Lemen Clark. New York: Columbia University
Press, 1939.
- Baldwin, T. W. William Shakspeare's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke.
Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1944. 2 vols.
- Brinsley, John. A Consolation for Our Grammar Schooles. New York:
Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1943.
- Brooke, Arthur. Brooke's "Romeus and Juliet" Being the Original of
Shakespeare's "Romeo and Juliet" Newly Edited by J. J. Munro.
New York: Duffield and Company, 1908.
- Burton, Robert. The Anatomy of Melancholy. Edited by Floyd Dell
and Paul Jordan-Smith. New York: Tudor Publishing Company,
1941.
- Charlton, H. B. Shakespearian Tragedy. Cambridge: The University
Press, 1949.
- Clark, Donald Lemen. John Milton at St. Paul's School. New York:
Columbia University Press, 1948.
- Clemen, Wolfgang H. The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.
- Elizabethan Critical Essays. Edited by G. Gregory Smith. London:
Oxford University Press, 1904. 2 vols.
- Ellacombe, H. N. The Plant-Lore and Garden-Craft of Shakespeare.
London: E. Arnold, 1896.
- Evans, B. Ifor. The Language of Shakespeare's Plays. London:
Methuen & Company, Ltd, 1952.
- Farnham, Willard. The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy.
Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963.
- Hoole, Charles. A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching School.
Edited by Thiselton Mark. Syracuse: C. W. Bardeen, 1912.

- Horace. The Complete Works of Horace. Translated by various hands.
London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd, 1923.
- Isocrates. Isocrates. Translated by George Norlin. London:
William Heinemann, Ltd, 1928. 3 vols.
- John Quincy Adams Memorial Studies. Edited by J. G. McManaway et al.
Washington: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1948.
- Kelly, Faye L. Prayer in Sixteenth-Century England. Gainesville:
University of Florida Press, 1966.
- Lodge, Thomas. Lodge's "Rosalynde," Being the Original of Shakespeare's
"As You Like It." Edited by W. W. Greg. New York: Duffield and
Company, 1907.
- Longinus. On the Sublime. Translated by Benedict Einarson. Chicago:
Packard and Company, 1945.
- Muir, Kenneth. Shakespeare's Sources. Vol. I: Comedies and Tragedies.
London: Methuen & Company, Ltd, 1961.
- Old and Scarce Tracts on Money. London: P. S. King & Son, Ltd, 1933.
- Phipson, Emma. The Animal-Lore of Shakespeare's Time. London:
K. Paul, Trench & Company, 1883.
- Plutarch. Plutarch's Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans. Trans-
lated by Sir Thomas North. London: David Nutt, 1895. 6 vols.
- Quintilian. The Institutio Oratoria. Translated by H. E. Butler.
London: William Heinemann, Ltd, 1936. 4 vols.
- Reed, Robert Rentoul, Jr. Bedlam on the Jacobean Stage. Cambridge:
Harvard University Press, 1952.
- Rich, Barnabe. Rich's Farewell to Military Profession, 1581. Edited
by Thomas Mabry Cranfill. Austin: University of Texas Press,
1959.
- Seneca. Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales. Translated by Richard M. Gummere.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962. 3 vols.
- Shakespeare, William. The Complete Works of Shakespeare. Edited by
George Lyman Kittredge. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1936.
- _____. Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies,
A Facsimile Edition Prepared by Helge Kokeritz. New Haven: Yale
University Press, 1954.
- _____. A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. Vol. VIII: As You
Like It. Vol. XIII: Twelve Night, or What You Will. Edited
by Horace Howard Furness. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company,
1890, 1901. 26 vols.

- _____. Romeo and Juliet. (Second Quarto, 1599, Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles No. 6.) Edited by W. W. Greg. London: The Shakespeare Association and Sidgwick and Jackson, Ltd, 1949.
- Spurgeon, Caroline F.E. Shakespeare's Imagery and What It Tells Us. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935.
- Stauffer, Donald A. Shakespeare's World of Images. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1949.
- Thrall, William Flint, and Hibbard, Addison. A Handbook to Literature. New York: The Odyssey Press, 1936.
- Virgil. Virgil's Works. Translated by J. W. Mackail. New York: The Modern Library, 1934.
- Wellek, René, and Warren, Austin. Theory of Literature. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1956.
- White, Harold Ogden. Plagiarism and Imitation During the English Renaissance. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Don W. Der was born December 20, 1927, at Muskogee, Oklahoma, and attended public schools in Oklahoma City. During World War II he served overseas with the 101st Airborne Division. In 1951 he received the degrees of Bachelor of Arts with a major in philosophy and Bachelor of Arts in Library Science from the University of Oklahoma. In 1952 he held a Rockefeller Archival Fellowship at the University of Oklahoma Library; from 1952 to 1953 he was with the Oklahoma City Public Library; and from 1953 to 1956, with the Oklahoma State Library. In 1956 he enrolled in the Graduate School of the University of Florida and received the degree of Master of Arts with a major in English in June, 1960. While a candidate for the Master of Arts degree he was a graduate assistant in the University of Florida Libraries during the 1956-1957 academic year; interim humanities librarian and instructor of library science, 1957-1958; interim social science librarian, 1958-1959; and graduate assistant in Comprehensive English, 1959-1960. While pursuing the degree of Doctor of Philosophy he has served as instructor in Comprehensive English, 1960-1962 and 1963-1965, and instructor in Comprehensive Logic, 1965-1968. During the academic year 1962-1963 he held a Graduate School Fellowship.

Don W. Der is married to the former Anne Wigginton and is the father of a son.

This dissertation was prepared under the direction of the chairman of the candidate's supervisory committee and has been approved by all members of that committee. It was submitted to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and to the Graduate Council, and was approved as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

December, 1968

E. Ruffin Jones
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Dean, Graduate School

Supervisory Committee:

W. Herbert
Chairman

Robert Williams
Thomas Hume

